

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26669

commission a study of the business and financial laws of Greece and Turkey, with the objective of a conference of leading lawyers and legal scholars to see whether cooperation here would be fruitful.

All these are avenues to be explored. Some may prove to be blind alleys; but progress in the short time during which the project has been underway is highly encouraging.

There is one final thought I would like to express. That is that on all sides we have been cautioned not to be impatient, to recognize that feasibility studies take time, that specific results will be slow, that the consequences of our efforts will be measured over a long and not a short period of time. And this advice has come to us from those who are most strong in their support of the project.

We recognize that the results, in some senses, will show up only in some years. This has been known from the beginning. At the same time, we hope to be able to present quite specific results in a relatively short time. Some of these will be feasibility studies and recommendations. Some of these will be the establishment of better means of communication, of liaison groups, for example. Some will be the creation of ways and means of implementing study recommendations.

But the most important result is already here and now, tangible. This is the demonstrated ability of businessmen, scholars and others from Greece and Turkey to work together, with the encouragement of this project, toward the solution of their mutual problems of economic development. That result, as I say, is already a fact. It must be extended and made more specific. But it is clear that it exists, and that the work due until now confirms its existence.

I thus feel that we can, on the record, be pleased with the establishment of the Special Committee of which I have the honour to be Chairman. I can appropriately commend my Vice Chairmen, our esteemed colleagues, Messrs. Gulek and Spanorigas, and to other members of the Special Committee, the Executive and European Directors, Messrs. Rubin and Zumbiehl, and I can justifiably express a certain confidence for the future.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO GREEK-TURKISH PROJECT

D. S. and R. N. Gettesman Foundation, \$5,000 (have pledged \$10,000), March 1965.
 Arthur and Gloria Ross Foundation, \$1,000, March 1965.
 U.S. Freight Co., \$2,000, April-August 1965.
 Soconoy-Mobil Oil Co., \$5,000, August 1965.
 Pfizer International Inc., \$1,000, August 1965.
 Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., \$500, August 1965.
 Trans-World Airlines, \$1,500, August 1965.
 Singer Co. Foundation, \$250, September 1965.
 Ford Foundation, \$150,000, April 1965.
 Total, \$166,250, September 21, 1965.

MEMBERS OF U.S. ADVISORY GROUP FOR GREEK-TURKISH PROJECT

- Mr. John B. Arnold, senior vice president, First National City Bank, New York City.
- Mr. Amory Bradford, consultant to the Ford Foundation, New York City.
- Mr. Tom B. Coughran, executive vice president, Bank of America, New York City.
- Mr. Richard C. Fenton, president, Pfizer International, Inc., New York City.
- Mr. Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co., New York City.
- Mr. George F. James, senior vice president, Socony-Mobil Oil Co., New York City.
- Mr. Henry W. Manville, vice president, the Singer Co., New York City.
- Mr. Robert H. Mathews, senior vice president, American Express Co., New York City.
- Mr. H. L. Nathan, vice president, Parsons & Whittemore, Inc., New York City.

Mr. Arthur Ross, executive vice president and managing director, Central National Corp., New York City.

Mr. Francis X. Scafuro, vice president, Bank of America, New York City.

Mr. Spyros Skouras, chairman of the board, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., New York City.

Mr. Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president, Trans-World Airlines, New York City.

Adm. John M. Will, U.S. Navy, retired, president and chairman of the board, American Export and Isbrandtsen Lines, New York City.

Mr. Sidney H. Wiener, vice president and general counsel, Hilton Hotels International, New York City.

JAVITS NAMES SEYMOUR RUBIN AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION PROJECT—ALBERT ZUMBIEHL OF FRANCE IS EUROPEAN DIRECTOR

The appointment of Seymour J. Rubin, former U.S. Minister to the Development Assistance Committee and prominent Washington attorney, as Executive Director of the Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation project was announced today by Senator Jacob K. Javits. Senator Javits is Chairman of the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which is sponsoring the project.

Announced as European Director of the project was Albert Zumbiehl of Paris, formerly a member of the OECD Business and Industry Advisory Committee and an international financial expert.

Principal offices for the project will be in Washington, with European offices at the Atlantic Institute in Paris.

In making the announcement, Senator Javits said: "Mr. Rubin's decision to take on this important assignment is a giant step forward in developing participation of the public and private sectors in Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and other countries in economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey. With his expertise in international finance and his working knowledge of international organizations, Mr. Rubin has excellent qualifications to direct this project. The European Director, Albert Zumbiehl, also brings great experience and accomplishment in international economic cooperation to this assignment. Economic cooperation on a specific project basis between Greece and Turkey is logical, can be most beneficial to the people of each country, and can inaugurate a historic movement in binational cooperation."

The committee to oversee the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project was set up at the plenary session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in November 1964 with Senator Javits as Chairman, Alexander Spanorigas, member of the Parliament of Greece and Deputy Minister of Commerce, and Kasim Gulek, member of the Turkish National Assembly as cochairmen. With assistance from the Ford Foundation and contributions from major American corporations, the project has already researched possibilities for joint Greek-Turkish ventures that would economically benefit both nations.

A similar project initiated by Senator Javits in 1962 led to the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), a private, multinational investment organization now channelling equity capital to Latin American private enterprise on a partnership basis with local businessmen.

Mr. Rubin, 51, was U.S. Representative to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development until January 1964. During 1962 and 1963, he was the U.S. member of the OECD Consortia on Greece and

Turkey. A native of Chicago, Mr. Rubin graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School and served in a number of Government posts until 1948, when he returned to private practice of law.

Since then Mr. Rubin has been frequently appointed by the Government to undertake special missions. He served as chief of the NATO Tax Delegation in 1951-52, with the personal rank of Minister; was Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act in 1952-53; and was a consultant in connection with the Hoover Commission Report on Foreign Aid and the task force on the same subject set up in 1961. He was named by President Kennedy as a public member of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, and was nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as General Counsel of the International Cooperation Administration and the Agency for International Development in 1961. He also served in 1962 as personal representative of the President to Bolivia, with the rank of Special Ambassador.

Mr. Zumbiehl, 45, was with the French Ministry of Finance from 1945 to 1955. Since then, he has directed important aspects of the international finance relations of a major French aluminum and nonferrous metals firm. Mr. Zumbiehl has also been a member of the Business and Industry Advisory Committee of the OECD.

A SYMBOL OF WELCOME AT HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Statue of Liberty on Liberty Island has long marked this Nation's eastern gateway to the land of liberty and freedom and has come to symbolize our democracy throughout the world.

Mr. John Barovich, vice president of the Computer Programmers Association in Honolulu recently suggested that a memorial of similar significance be erected in Honolulu, our Nation's western gateway, as a symbol of welcome to our Pacific and Asian neighbors.

I believe that this suggestion is particularly timely in view of the passage of the recent Immigration Reform Act. I feel confident that the people of Hawaii would be most willing to support such a project. I believe that Mr. Barovich's suggestion is an excellent one and I wish to call upon my colleagues for their views and suggestions on this matter.

CIVIL DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there are no words strong enough to express my personal contempt for those cowardly young people who demonstrate against their country and our national security.

They would be pathetic and unworthy of attention were it not for the fact that others are fighting and dying to preserve the freedom these inconsiderate and ungrateful people are abusing.

There may be some among this confused group who have been misled by Communists or unprincipled traitors, and because of their irresponsibility do not recognize what they are doing. If they are students, as some of them claim to be, then it is obvious they never studied American history.

If they devoted as much time on history books as they have in their dis-

26670

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 20, 1965

graceful demonstrations, they might have learned something about how this Nation won and maintained freedom.

Liberty never has been and cannot now be preserved by crawling meekly before international bullies or power-mad dictators. We have freedom today for all Americans, even a misguided minority, because millions were willing to fight for it yesterday.

Nothing of value in all recorded history has ever been achieved or preserved without sacrifice. Those who are unwilling to fulfill their patriotic duty as Americans most assuredly do not deserve to enjoy the benefits made available by the responsible citizens of this Nation.

As for those few ingrates who actually have destroyed their draft cards, I hope they will be prosecuted swiftly and punished severely. The law of this Congress making such activity a Federal offense is one which I supported wholeheartedly.

ECONOMIC INEQUITIES

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, poor living conditions and solidified unemployment plague part of my home State of Kentucky, as they plague parts of some neighboring States. This is not a cause for despair, but it certainly is a real cause for positive analysis of the elements of employment as such. Unless we know the economic and social ingredients of total employment, no amount of Government pump priming is going to rid us of the one and only reason for poverty. That sole reason, of course, is unemployment.

It may sound odd to say simply that unemployment is the result of low employment. I submit to the Senate, however, that this is the real starting point in any solution of unemployment. We have been getting out of bed on the wrong side, and we have started the poverty program off on the wrong foot.

Instead of analyzing the vacuum of unemployment, we must analyze concrete employment. The first is a negative approach, but the second is a positive approach. If we can label, isolate, and measure the various elements that comprise total employment, then we can strengthen the weak elements and ignore the strong ones.

But no, we do not operate this way. Instead, we throw billions of dollars into one vacuum after another when we could easily spend only a fraction of the poverty program moneys to find out just where we are weak and where we are strong. This would be positive economic analysis, a type of work that apparently is quite foreign to the minds of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

If a businessman is forced by law to sell his output below the cost of production, then I say that law produces an economic inequity. The businessman goes broke; and we as a national economy are worse off because of it.

This is an obvious example, indeed, but there are many economic inequities in this land of ours that are not so obvious. In fact, some of them even look pretty good. One dandy-looking eco-

nomic inequity of hideous proportions is the so-called poverty program that I mention and that is eating away the Nation's economic profit. This disjointed, political program is marching east on a train moving west. We are spending billions of dollars that represent the real wealth of the economy to keep the train moving and the marchers marching. The trouble with this extravagant inequity is that nobody is going anywhere. But that is not all there is to it, for our national economy is going somewhere because of it. That somewhere is down, way down.

The thoughts I have expressed here today were brought to mind by a newspaper article published recently in Harlan County, Ky. As most of you know, Harlan County long has been beset by unemployment of the worst and most protracted kind. The article was written by Mr. William D. Pardridge, whom many of us in the Senate know as the author of the newspaper series entitled "Economic Inequities."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Education, Not the Dole, Is Said Harlan County's Hope," written by William D. Pardridge and published October 14, 1965, in the Harlan, Ky., Daily Enterprise, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harlan (Ky.) Daily Enterprise, Oct. 14, 1965]

AN ECONOMIC INEQUITY: EDUCATION, NOT THE DOLE, IS SAID HARLAN COUNTY'S HOPE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of the following article, William D. Pardridge, is a former editor of the Washington publication, Air Affairs. He has been working on a doctorate degree in economics at the University of Chicago, but left to spend 9 months writing a series of 50 articles on "economic inequities." This is one of the articles in the series, which is to be published in book form next year.)

(By William D. Pardridge)

Man-made economic inequities sometimes become economic inequities.

Poverty is one of them.

Lack of education is another.

They are iniquitous because they tend to beget themselves as their carriers beget children.

Face it. No amount of bootstrap Government financing is going to get rid of poverty. Jobs come from business and industry, not from Washington executive orders.

And remember that personal education and personal employment do not go hand in hand. Youngsters must be members of the student body, not the labor force. At early ages, kids and teenagers cannot be both, and membership in neither is worst of all.

Just what is an economic inequity? It is an ogre of the materialistic world, like the devil is of another.

SALES TAX IS INEQUITABLE

Economic inequities are caused by laws that are enacted for willful political gain by legislative bodies completely ignorant of economic principles. They are shrouded with good intentions.

One vicious inequity is the sales tax. This monster reduces the purchasing power of the poor in order to raise public revenues for the not-so-poor, the not-poor-at-all, and the rich.

The iniquitous nature of the sales tax is that it seems to be so small. But small also are the bacteria that gradually rot your teeth.

All governments, local, State, and Federal, continually want to raise public revenues for ever larger social responsibilities that bring home the political bacon.

But every dime of such expenditures is axed off the general economic health of the Nation.

Take two extreme examples of governmental social responsibilities that cost real economic wealth.

WON'T RISK POCKETBOOK

Police protection is undeniably the responsibility of public bodies.

Our free economic way of life that helped produce the miraculous American political system, as did the latter system itself also yield that productive way of life, is based upon private property and the safeguarding of the individual's life and limb.

Police protection is a legitimate public expense. Even here a social inequity, not economic, appears when policemen—and firemen—are paid wages so low that this livelihood has never become the profession of respected trade or craft it certainly is.

The citizenry is quick to demand and order a policeman to risk his life arresting an armed maniac, but the stingy homeowner is reluctant to risk his pocketbook. Let's you and him fight, he says.

Far, far away from police protection is that economically grotesque social responsibility known as the farm pork barrel, the system that artificially regulates crop acreage and determines agricultural prices.

All this is done in a Washington smoke-filled room instead of at the grocery store counter.

A MAMMOTH INEQUITY

Across this land there are farmers who don't farm, farmers who regularly receive free Government checks, all the while low-income people pay taxes to increase food prices so that they'll have less money to pay for shoes.

If you think this makes economic sense, you're an idiot.

This whole tax structure is a mammoth inequity.

The near-rich and the rich have so many tax loopholes that the graduated income tax is a joke.

The wage earners pay income taxes, for instance, to send Midwest wheat to Communist Russia in foreign-flag ships. And the State Department thinks this is great.

Any poverty in Harlan County is not the fault of the people. It is caused by technological advances and by a flow of economic change that sometimes goes around your land and my land.

The remedies for such natural hardships are not gigantic economic inequities like second-generation dole, like handouts to non-farming farmers, like expensive job training for jobs that are too few.

The remedy is the good riddance of all economic inequities and the pronouncement of an economic equity based on the rights and the freedoms of the individual—the businessman, the wage earner, the housewife.

Poverty, never forget, is caused only by a lack of employment and a lack of employment is caused only by the job and the worker not coming to terms with each other.

Jobs change relentlessly to more and more complicated technological, skilled duties.

Vocational education, not the world's greatest government handout, is the answer to these changes that man cannot stop.

The economic plenty that once was America can be returned to Harlan County by having two schools on every street corner.

One school is for the boys and girls who don't know what they want to be, except they don't want to be jellyfish.

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26747

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from amounts appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year, which amount shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 55. Page 38, line 5, strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,500,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield myself such time as I may require and yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the conferees.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the entire subcommittee for the good work they have done on this very difficult bill.

May I call special attention to the following language in the statement of the managers:

The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

With new farm legislation just enacted, and with the many new problems related thereto, the conferees also agree that no changes should be made in prior year agricultural conservation program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. Any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee. The committee recommends that full and complete information be submitted in the congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

I wish to join Mr. WHITTEN, chairman of the subcommittee in insisting that the Department follow the statement of the managers in the foregoing matters.

The skip-row practice to which reference has been made is absolutely vital in certain areas of the Cotton Belt and the agricultural conservation program is vital to farmers throughout the Nation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,500,000, of which \$250,000 shall be available solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities not later than June 30, 1966."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report and include certain tables.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 8370.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DO NOT LIKE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was an extremely disagreeable thing to me to see the recent wave of demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. America has been shamed by the spectacle of organized treason and blatant cowardice which we have witnessed. It should be obvious that nationwide demonstrations do not just happen. There is careful planning and organization back of it, and certainly it is Communist inspired. The press has played up pictures of young punks tearing up or burning draft cards. This sort of thing is encouraged by half-baked professors and Communist sympathizers, as well as by professional agitators.

Fortunately, such demonstrations involve an extremely small percentage of college students, but they make noise and attract attention. I am highly gratified to note that the administration has ordered the FBI to crack down on the ring-leaders. The right of peaceful assembly envisions responsible and loyal Americans assembled together in righteous indignation against the elements of oppression and injustices; not a lot of crackpots who have little comprehension of world problems or American responsibilities. America needs a solid and unified front before the world. We cannot allow the American image to be dimmed and distorted by spectacles such as we have witnessed.

More than a crackdown is needed. We should be witnessing a tremendous outpouring of patriotism from the campuses of the Nation. University officials should be leading a crusade for America to give students an opportunity to show that the very great majority of them are sincere and patriotic young Americans who love this country and who refuse to be involved in the things we have witnessed.

RESTORE RENT SUPPLEMENTS

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include a letter sent to the committee.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to see the editorial in yesterday's New York Times urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full \$30 million in rent supplement payments requested by the administration. The editorial reads as follows:

RESTORE RENT SUBSIDIES

In a surprise move, the House last week voted to kill the funds needed to start the new rent subsidy program for low-income families. The House Appropriations Committee had already reduced the figure far below the administration's request. Since the House had its opportunity to vote on the substantive merits of the program when it approved the housing bill, it was irresponsible and demagogic for opponents to exploit a vote on a routine money bill in order to reverse that decision.

We urge the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full \$30 million requested by the administration. Rent subsidies are a promising innovation. They deserve a full and fair trial.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the Harvey amendment on the House floor last Thursday was most regrettable. Despite the fact that the House early in the year in a close battle had worked its will to authorize a rent supplement program and despite the further fact that the Appropriations Committee had drastically slashed the \$30 million authorization for the first year to \$6 million, the foes of this promising new program were able to mount a successful ambush.

The ammunition used by the supporters of the Harvey amendment was drawn from preliminary regulations issued by the agency which were purely tentative and distributed for discussion purposes and to stimulate early interest from prospective sponsors. The members of the House will recall certain hypothetical "horror cases" the opposition dreamed up to argue that the benefits of the rent supplement program could in some cases go to families with very substantial assets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress to my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle that because of apparent misunderstanding or misinterpretation these purely tentative regulations have in effect been withdrawn and I am confident they will be revised to make certain that the benefits of the rent supplement program are available only to families and individuals in the public housing income group and will rule out those with any substantial amounts of liquid assets. The attached letter sent on Monday by the FHA Commissioner clearly emphasizes the tentative and preliminary nature of the original regulations and that substantial revisions will be made before they are issued in final form.

Mr. Speaker, it is my deepest hope that the Senate will be able to restore a substantial amount of funds to launch the rent supplement program and that the final conference report will contain such funds. This program which would harness the resources of private enterprise

26748

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

and private capital to provide housing for low-income families is a crucial part of President Johnson's attack on urban problems and the Congress must not let him down.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.

To: All approved mortgagees.

Subject: Rent supplement program.

In the rent supplement program letter 65-11 which was distributed on September 28, 1965, it was emphasized that the material was being supplied so that preliminary discussions could be held with sponsors and other prospective participants. It also was to afford an opportunity for review within and outside the Agency so that the feasibility of the requirements and procedures could be reviewed and considered. This was because the program cannot be made operative until funding is authorized.

None of the distributed regulations or procedures should be considered as effective or governing. As a result of comment and suggestions received, appropriate revisions will be made to strengthen various provisions. In the event funding is provided the necessary regulations and instructions will be issued in final form.

Sincerely,

PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

SOVIET UNION PRACTICING A POLICY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now we have been aware that the Soviet Union, despite its denials, has been practicing—consciously and deliberately—a policy of anti-Semitism. We have been uncertain about its reasons, although it would seem clear that Moscow is seeking to impose a terrible uniformity upon its citizens, while at the same time currying favor with the Arab countries. This week there occurred at the United Nations an incident which, in my view, exposes to the entire world the Soviet Union's hypocrisy. I see no means now for Moscow to deny that it has embraced the heinous doctrines that it fought so well in the war that ended only 20 years ago.

I am proud that in performing an act of great righteousness our own Government exposed the Soviet hypocrisy. On October 8, the United States introduced an amendment to the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The U.S. amendment reads:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to its jurisdiction.

It was not easy, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to introduce that amendment. There are many countries besides the Soviet Union that do not sympathize with efforts to erase anti-Semitism from the earth. Political expediency might have demanded that the United States remain silent. That we did not remain silent merits the commendation of this House. The United States took a courageous stand.

I might note that, once it was submitted, the Arab countries did put pressure on the United States to withdraw the amendment. These countries rarely miss an opportunity to fan the flames of anti-Semitic hatred. But the United States stood firm. Ambassador Goldberg personally assured me that we will not withdraw our proposal, but will, on the contrary, do everything possible to press its consideration to a successful conclusion.

But barely had the United States introduced its amendment when the Soviet Union sought to change it. I read the text of the alternate Soviet proposal:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism, zionism, nazism, neo-nazism and all other forms of the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, such an outrage as the equation of zionism with nazism and anti-Semitism? How does the Soviet Union dare to make such a shambles of honesty? How can it perpetrate such a thought? What hypocrisy. One would have thought that even the Soviet Union, in its unprincipled pursuit of political advantage, would have been less shocking or, at the least, less clumsy. Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet objective is to assist the Arabs in their efforts to destroy Israel? In mentioning zionism in the same breath with nazism, the Soviet Union surpassed even its own sorry record of deceit.

I need not dwell for my colleagues on the egregious effort to obscure truth. Let me say simply that zionism is not, like nazism, an expression of hate but an expression of love. It is not, like nazism, a message of destruction but a measure of construction. It does not, like nazism, seek to debase a people but to exalt them. It is not, like nazism, a philosophy of negation but of affirmation. Zionism is the movement to restore the Jewish homeland to the Jewish people. Its only relation to nazism is in its attempt to repair, in some measure, the wreckage that nazism caused. Zionism, Mr. Speaker, is—and I scarcely need say it—the very antithesis of nazism.

The Soviet Union knows, of course, what I have said to be true, but Moscow is attempting to exploit anti-Semitism both at home and now in the United Nations, to extend its influence into Africa and the Middle East. I am sure that the United States has succeeded in exposing its unworthy objectives for what they are and for all to see. The Soviet Union cares nothing about Jews or about justice. To Moscow, Jews and justice are merely tools to further its ignoble end.

The Bolivian Government, to whom we must all be grateful, took the initiative in countering the Soviet slander in the United Nations. Bolivia moved to amend the Soviet proposal to eliminate the distasteful reference to zionism, while retaining the noble thoughts in which

Moscow has hypocritically wrapped it. I state the Bolivian text:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism, nazism, in all its forms and manifestations, and all races involved in the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness; and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the decent peoples of the world will take note of the Soviet Union's unprincipled deception. I hope it casts doubt on the integrity of that country and on its pretensions to lead oppressed peoples around the world. The Soviet Union's purpose was to exploit Jews to serve its national interest. It would not hesitate to exploit any peoples for that purpose. I think the events which I have described at the United Nations gives ample testimony to Moscow's real aims and methods.

ANNUAL AWARDS BY CLEVELAND CIVIC LEAGUE

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Civic League held its first annual civic award night banquet and ball on October 15, 1965, at the Pick-Carter Hotel. At an impressive ceremony the league paid honor to 11 Clevelanders for "Outstanding achievement in community service."

Those honored were: Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press; our distinguished colleague, CHARLES VANIK, who ably represents the 21st Congressional District of Ohio; Leo Jackson, an outstanding councilman on the Cleveland City Council; Judge Paul D. White of the Cleveland Municipal Court; Helen Lyons, clerk of the Cleveland Municipal Court; State representative, Carl B. Stokes; Dr. Kenneth Clement; Ellsworth H. Harpole; John O. Holly; Joseph Polo, and Harold Williams.

The purpose of these awards, in the words of James W. Wilson, president of the league, is "to encourage other citizens to participate in civic activity in Cleveland thereby elevating its standards to the level that we may be proud to say, 'Cleveland is the best location in the Nation.'"

The success of self-government is dependent upon citizen interest and participation in the many phases of community activities. This is particularly true in our large metropolitan centers such as Cleveland. When citizen initiative fails to encourage voluntary activities for the advancement of a community one of two results follow. Either government must take on more functions that can best be accomplished by voluntary action, or the community falls behind in meeting the challenges of progress. The Cleveland Civic League is dedicated to a six-point civic program which is aimed at encouraging maximum citizen participation in the affairs of the community.

qualify for graduation, each of us would have to master the "three R's" of reading, writing and arithmetic. "But," she continued, "I hope you learn far more than that in my classroom because, in order to achieve true happiness and success in life, you will have to master an additional set of 'R's,' the 'three R's' of Americanism—reason, respect, and responsibility."

Then she added, "You will also find that there is a fourth 'R' which is sacred to America. It is religion."

Today, there is a most urgent need for Americans to rededicate themselves to the strong moral principles upon which our Nation was founded.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out."

Faith dominated the atmosphere at Independence Hall in Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were framed.

Faith is our mainstay in the ideological struggle now raging between the camps of God-less communism and human freedom.

And faith remains our strongest bulwark against the criminal and subversive enemies who would destroy our priceless heritage of liberty and justice for all. But faith without work will be of no avail—there must be unity of purpose.

America will continue to progress in dignity and freedom so long as our people cherish liberty and justice and truth and honor God.

Faith in God. That is the fortress of free men.

COMPULSORY UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the October 5 issue of the Chicago Daily News appeared an article entitled "Union Victory in Court Stirs Rights Issue," written by John M. Johnston. I quote especially one sentence from Mr. Johnston's article, in these prefatory remarks:

However, these union shop contracts were originally sanctioned by the courts on the representation that the only obligation imposed on the unwilling members was the payment of dues. It was only fair, ran the argument, that all workers in a plant should share the cost of bargaining that presumably benefited all.

The decision of the circuit court of appeals in declaring that a union has a right to fine a member for crossing a picket line demonstrates how far beyond the original reasons given for the legitimacy of compulsory union membership the courts have gone.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION VICTORY IN COURT STIRS RIGHTS ISSUE

(By John M. Johnston)

A labor contract that requires employees to join a union as a condition of keeping their jobs can be called compulsory unionism, for the element of compulsion is clear. The unions prefer to call this requirement a "union security" clause, although it is not clear why a union cannot be secure without lassoing unwilling members. A neutral description is "union shop."

So, when the U.S. circuit court of appeals here recently handed down an opinion in which it cited, among the facts of the case, the existence of a union security clause, you

got a good idea at once of how the decision would fall.

And it did. The court upheld the right of the United Auto Workers to fine members who had crossed a picket line to work during a strike. A footnote in the opinion implied that the fines of \$20 to \$100 were modest, since the union constitution provides for fines up to \$100, and each crossing of the picket line was a separate offense.

Now that the principle has been established, unions need not be so restrained, and a strikebreaker could be fined a ruinous sum—and one collectible through the courts.

The opinion, written by Circuit Judge Roger J. Kiley, gave the unions an exhilarating incidental bonus by its assertion that "a union is a form of industrial government" with its members having "duties * * * similar to those of citizens in a democratic society."

This is the contention the unions have been making in the fight to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section permits the States, through right-to-work laws, to prohibit these "union security" contracts. But if unions are to be a form of industrial government, no worker can be exempt from their jurisdiction.

However, these union shop contracts were originally sanctioned by the courts on the representation that the only obligation imposed on the unwilling members was the payment of dues. It was only fair, ran the argument, that all workers in a plant should share the cost of bargaining that presumably benefited all.

Now, however, unions have become a form of government and can compel obedience to the will of the majority by fines.

It seems to me that if a worker chooses voluntarily to subject himself to union discipline by joining, he has no complaint at being punished for violating the rules. But an unwilling member, dragooned into the union on the plea that he should help pay for its bargaining, is deprived of due process of law when he is subjected to fines.

The court asserted that unions must have the power to fine members in order to control wildcat strikes. Again, the argument may be valid for voluntary members. But a wildcat strike is in violation of contract, is subject to injunction, and strikers could be fired by their employer. No further union club should be necessary.

The questions raised in this case are fundamental to the issue of repeal of 14(b) which the U.S. Senate is considering this week. The decision ought to be proof enough that right-to-work laws provide a basic protection for the civil rights of a minority.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging reports which I have heard in recent weeks on our military operations in Vietnam is contained in an address by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, before the 22d annual luncheon meeting of the National Security Industrial Association, October 7, in Washington.

General Johnson cited a resident of Hawaii, S. Sgt. James K. Akuna, 1st Battalion, 503d Infantry, Lanai City, Lanai, for the enterprise and bravery which he displayed in a rice paddy area not far from Saigon.

I am pleased to call this address to the attention of my Senate colleagues. If there are no objections I respectfully request that this address be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Last January it was my privilege to speak before the 17th annual Pacific coast regional dinner held by your association in Los Angeles. I had recently returned from my second trip to Vietnam, and what I had seen going on in that country was very much on my mind.

I felt impelled to talk about Vietnam, because I was not certain that people fully appreciated or had much knowledge about what we are trying to do in that part of the world. In the 10 months that have passed, events have moved so rapidly that while it is still important to explain why we are in Vietnam, it is perhaps more important to explain how we are doing there.

Much of my working time these days is taken up with our situation in Vietnam, and the efforts the Army is taking to improve its performance in this chapter of its history. Your forces are performing exceptionally well under the extremely trying and difficult conditions of a war in which the front is everywhere and remains difficult to identify.

I am certain you read one or more of our newspapers and news magazines and thus know as much as I do about the press coverage of the Vietnam situation. I must say that our press people in the field and here in Washington are doing a fine analytical job in keeping the American public informed. Unlike the criticism that has developed out of some past international crises, I can assure you that the Government is making available to the American press just about all the news that can be released without infringing on security.

Thus today I am not going to dwell in any detail on why we are in Vietnam. Instead, I would like to say a few words about the broader implications of the Vietnam event—why it exists at all; what along this line we can anticipate in the future; and what the Army is trying to do about it.

If we can stand back a bit from current events and take a broader look at our times, it is possible to see that Vietnam is just part of a pattern of events that have taken place since the end of World War II. In the span of the last 20 years there have been more than 240 wars of one kind or another. Discarding inconsequential conflicts, one can list over 100 significant instances of resort to violence in the political process. Almost all of these disruptions of the peaceful political process took place in relatively undeveloped countries located in the Southern Hemisphere—in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia. Ninety percent of these were revolutions—armed insurgencies—afflicting in total some 68 nations. Communists were identifiably prominent in at least 50 percent of these attacks against established governments.

Whether we as Americans agreed with the policies of the governments concerned is not as important as the fact that both the frequency of this conflict, and the incidence of Communist participation are adverse. If we project the record of the past 20 years statistically into the future, we can reasonably expect a certain number of such conflicts in the months and years ahead of us, if this trend continues. There is no reason to expect that the trend will not continue, and we can regard the Vietnam event only as the largest, current manifestation of this turn in international politics.

Research into this phenomena of our times has been revealing. The causes of insurgency, and the ever-present danger of its "escalation" as we currently witness it, are basically twofold:

First, we are witnessing in our century something new in social evolution. In our

generation there are large populations of formerly primitive peoples who are no longer satisfied with the life their fathers left to them. Advances in education and international communication have brought to them knowledge and realization that Western society as we know it is enjoying an incomparable prosperity and standard of living. Dissatisfied with their own economic status, these traditional societies—many of them newly organized into young, emergent nations—show a tremendous surge in desire to modernize themselves.

This desire for progress bears with it many internal pressures. The rising expectations of the people bring them to demand more of their community, more of their national government, more, indeed, of life itself. Often these aroused hopes are frustrated by political instability and economic stagnation. Feeling these internal pressures, some of the political leaders of these nations are attracted to proposals and assistance which appear to offer some quick relief to their plight.

It is at this point that the second cause of incipient insurgency frequently enters the international picture. This is the deliberate attempt of a Communist power to seize control of an emerging nation, either through economic blandishment or through armed force.

We have had a perfect example of this in the recent upheaval in the Dominican Republic. This was an instance where certain dissident elements in the Dominican Army mutinied in an attempt to overthrow the triumvirate which was the then established government of the country. Whether the government could have quelled this mutiny, particularly if it had acted a little faster, remains unknown. What is certain, however, is that the actions taken by the Communist elements in the country to seize control of the mutiny undermined the government's capability to control the mutiny and prevent national damage and loss of life.

The rebels were themselves divided, some wanting to restore former President Juan Bosch and others opposing his restoration. The Bosch supporters took to the streets, and the revolutionary movement took a tragic turn. Arms from the military arsenals were handed out to the civilian rebels. Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba, took increasing control of the revolution. What began as a popular democratic revolution that was committed to democracy and social justice moved into the hands of Communist conspirators.

In Vietnam we have seen quite a different situation, although the end objective has been the same—seizure of absolute power by a Communist government.

In Vietnam the Communists have been working underground ever since the withdrawal of the French following the defeat at Dienbienphu. Indeed, the Communists have been at work on their designs in southeast Asia ever since the Japanese moved in there during World War II.

Initial Communist attempts in South Vietnam did not take the form of attempted popular uprising. There is much evidence that, whereas the Central Government in Saigon was left alone, a subtly organized campaign was conducted to seize control of the country at the local governmental level. We know that the Communists—or Vietcong—have for some years been trying to take over control of the people. The tactics used are persuasion and terror. Communist cells operating within the villages systematically murdered the village chiefs and other local officials who did not cooperate. By the end of 1964 about 15,000 small officials had been assassinated in this way. These tactics might have been more noticeable to the outside world if the Chief of State had been assassinated, or if 15,000 soldiers had been killed in an organized

military campaign, but the Vietcong did not operate that way. They subverted the countryside—in effect tried to isolate Saigon politically—and collected their own taxes. You might say that the Communists were not outfighting the Saigon Government by military means; it was not necessary. They were undermining the Government in many rural areas through terrorism.

The Government reacted eventually and we have seen a steady increase in counter-guerrilla activity until other nations, including our own, have been drawn into the conflict in a most intimate way.

Thus, within the last few months we have had two entirely different examples of armed insurrections, but they illustrate the types of international disorder we have been experiencing on an ascending scale since the end of the Korean war. Both were attacks against established government, and ostensibly by peoples within the Nation itself though Communist support was clearly evident. Both were undeveloped countries burdened with uncertain political stability and economic insufficiency.

You are fully aware that the Army is not a policymaking organization. It is merely an instrument of policy. As such an instrument we have learned that we, and the other services, are being employed today in operations which, although some military combat may be involved, cannot be classified as "war" as we have known it in the past.

Essentially, we are being employed by our Government to restore stability or to provide a climate of order in which government, under law, can function effectively in those instances where the United States has been asked for assistance and it is clearly in our national interest to provide assistance.

As you are aware, in the last few years considerable money has been spent in modernizing the Army and the other military services. Since 1961, the Army alone has invested over \$9 billion in weapons, equipment, ammunition, and other supplies. I must add that we are not through procuring modern materiel. To support the war in Vietnam and other commitments, the administration has asked Congress for an additional \$2,400 million of which more than \$600 million will be spent on Army procurement.

These are big money figures. They represent taxes paid by all of us, and they represent, in part, the investment the American people have put into our capability to bring an end to Communist-supported insurgency as we have witnessed it in the Caribbean and in southeast Asia. Therefore, it is entirely proper for citizens to ask, "How are we doing?"

I am not going to be modest on this point, because our soldiers are doing a magnificent job around the world in everyday activities that speak louder than words. They are the men who stand on the firing line in some place like a street corner in Santo Domingo, or in a patch of jungle in South Vietnam. The manner in which they have conducted themselves gives me every conviction that we are doing very well, indeed.

To illustrate my general comment about "how we are doing," I want to describe very briefly several incidents which convey some feeling for the fighting spirit and morale of our soldiers who are manning freedom's defenses in Vietnam.

In the oppressive morning heat one day in early July, Sergeant Akuna's company of the 173d Airborne Brigade moved into position near a helicopter landing zone in a jungle and rice paddy area not far from Saigon. Before this operation by the 173d, the area—war zone D—had been a Vietcong stronghold for years and the Communists had been able to operate there without fear of attack. As the company began to occupy positions, Sergeant Akuna spotted a Vietcong guarding a rice cache. Someone shot the Vietcong in the leg after he tried to run, but he was

brought forward, given first aid, and taken out by helicopter for interrogation. About the time he was being airlifted out, Sergeant Akuna came back with four more Vietcong. He was dragging them out of holes—tunnels—down in a terrace, toward the end of the landing zone. They were all young men between the ages of 18 and 29, very sturdy and obviously not rice farmers because of the ammunition and grenades they carried. After he brought these four in, word came back that Sergeant Akuna had gone back, found three more and was bringing them in. On another occasion, Sergeant Akuna saw a nearby Vietcong hamlet. He took a reconnaissance patrol outside of the battalion perimeter to investigate sounds he had heard at dawn and in so doing discovered the hamlet which contained food and medical supplies.

These incidents and fighting spirit displayed by our dedicated soldiers are not isolated. They occur every day and night in various parts of Vietnam. And the spirit is displayed by all our soldiers—combat and combat support alike. On these operations that Sergeant Akuna participated in, soldiers of the 173d Airborne Brigade support battalion were located in the rear area near the aid station. As the first combat casualties came in, many soldiers of the support battalion crowded around the aid station, and besieged the commander of the 173d, who was at the station, to let them go forward as replacements.

This commander wrote to me recently about the sense of purpose and performance of his soldiers:

"The U.S. Army soldier has conducted himself in such a fine manner that I actually become emotional with pride. Our country should have no fear at all as it develops a sense of purpose at the top as well as our people have accepted it at the lower level. We are doing well, and at least from my view point, we are winning in Vietnam."

In another report, though not from this commander, I read about the impressions received by the senior Vietnamese and American officials who observed the landing of the 1st Cavalry Division at Qui Nhon. "As the landing craft touched down on the beaches, soldiers from that fine division marched down the ramps eight abreast carrying their colors. At the same time, helicopters were being flown from the aircraft carrier *Boxer* to airfields in the vicinity and within 10 minutes the men were in the helicopters and on their way to An Khe, 50 miles inland. There was no delay, no confusion, and it all created a marvelous impression of efficiency and ability to deal with any situation. This great American presence on the ground brings a tremendous feeling of hope and inspires confidence and courage among Vietnamese troops. There can no longer be the slightest doubt that persistence will bring success."

We are doing well, and we are taking advantage of our progress to do even better. Our units in Vietnam prepare periodically detailed reports on lessons learned from combat operations. These reports contain recommendations for improvement in training and equipment, based on actual operations, and are distributed widely throughout our school system and our commands for use in training, and in equipment research and development. Aside from these reports, the majority of our senior enlisted men and officers returning from Vietnam are assigned to our school system and commands in the United States so that we can capitalize on their practical experience and motivational spirit.

In addition to the combat lessons learned aspect of these reports, there is often praise for the equipment provided to our soldiers and occasionally suggestions about new types of equipment or for some improvements to existing equipment. The suggestions are carefully evaluated in the context of exist-

ing programs for improved equipment and where the state of the art and production leadtimes permit introduction of the suggested items of equipment, they are programmed for development and procurement. Praise for the existing equipment runs all the way from the new family of radios which operate particularly well in the demanding terrain and environmental conditions of Vietnam, to the helicopter and to the M-79 grenade launcher which allows the soldier to place accurately with lethal effect a fragmentation-type shell out to a distance of about 400 meters.

The helicopter has been one of our most valuable pieces of equipment. In addition to increased mobility and faster reaction time, it provides a close-in suppressive fire capability immediately preceding and during a helicopter troop lift into an assault area. The helicopter's battle staying capability is a matter of record. Between January 1962 and August 31 of this year, only 51 helicopters were lost to ground fire. The significance of this figure lies in the fact that when related to the actual sorties flown, this figure represents only one helicopter lost in battle for roughly every 16,614 sorties flown.

In an operation last July, over 3,000 of our combat troops in Vietnam were picked up in three different locations after a search and clear operation in war zone D, and returned to their bases in less than 3½ hours. This means that once they have searched multiple areas, soldiers do not have to waste time or energy reassembling. Moreover, they can move into combat with lighter loads because with helicopter resupply or extrication they do not need to carry in the extra supplies necessary to sustain them until ground supply or evacuation can take place.

If I can abstract a point from what I have said so far about how we are doing in Vietnam, it is this: The U.S. Army of 1965 is a highly professional, well-trained, and well-equipped combat force. The Army has deployed almost 44 percent of its strength overseas in 101 countries and territories, and it is fulfilling the investment in faith and money that has been made by the American people.

As the Army looks ahead to the tasks that the future probably holds, we do so with some measure of confidence. We know that we have the finest, best trained and equipped Army that this country has ever maintained in peacetime. Although we realize that the future may not be an entirely peaceful one, we are prepared to respond—in concert with the other agencies of our Government—to the requirements that may be demanded of us in building a community of stable nations, where political change can occur peacefully, and where nations have the right to determine their own destiny. Thus, as we move further into the nuclear age with its more sophisticated weapons systems, the Army finds that it must not only be prepared for general or limited war, but also be prepared for operations in unsophisticated situations and environments. In a sense, the Army must be prepared for missions unlimited, and if we are to continue to fulfill these missions with the best equipment obtainable, we will continue to need the assistance of the members of the National Security Industrial Association. I feel it appropriate to repeat, in this context, these words of the late Winston Churchill: "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

AIR TRANSPORT PROFIT AND LOWER FARES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, United Air Lines is one of our Nation's best and soundest transportation systems. This great airline pioneered transcontinental air service in this country, and Denver was one of the pioneer cities in this serv-

ice. United has been providing air service to my State's capital since 1938. Denver today is one of the principal operating bases of this fine company, and United employs approximately 2,300 persons at Denver.

Because of my lifetime interest in aviation and in all things which makes Colorado a better place to work and to live, I have followed the development of United Air Lines since it first came to my State. I know the officials of this great company and its management philosophy, and believe that under the 37 years of leadership of William Allan Patterson, presently chairman of its board of directors, it has become one of the most progressive, alert, and public-conscious companies throughout our country's whole industrial complex.

I have just read a speech which Mr. Patterson gave before the Economic Club of Detroit on October 18, on "Air Transport Profit and Lower Fares." This historical exposition of the development of the commercial air transport industry and its contributions to the economic and technological advancement of our country is most interesting and informative. It proves that profit is a good word and a must if our country is to continue to move forward. Profit, as Mr. Patterson demonstrates, is particularly critical to the commercial air transport industry as it enters the threshold of the supersonic air transport, probably the most explosively expensive changeover ever required of any industry in our Nation's economic history. In light of the extremely heavy reequipment programs through which most of the air carriers are now passing, plus the heavy financial burdens which lies almost immediately ahead in the development of the supersonic air transport, the present earnings of the air carriers are rather meager indeed, approximately 9½ percent for the industry.

I was interested to note in Mr. Patterson's speech that since 1962 the trunk-line average fare per passenger mile has declined by 6 percent; and that the average cost per mile to United's passengers has decreased from 6.4 to 5.7 cents, or 12 percent. Further, mail rates for the future have been reduced on United by about \$2 million; and the new free baggage allowance means that an extra \$3,600,000 will be retained annually by customers.

I am sure that the administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board are well aware of the acute importance of a financially strong commercial air transport industry to our national economy; and I have confidence that the regulatory agency will move forward slowly and most cautiously in the areas of their responsibilities so as not to create any major changes in the earnings situation of the air carriers in this extremely critical period of their development.

I request that Mr. Patterson's October 18 Detroit speech be made a part of my remarks and earnestly urge my colleagues to read this landmark speech because of its interest to all of us who want to maintain our commercial air transport industry as the greatest in the world, and to do this it must be kept fi-

nancially sound, with the necessary resources to enable it to look to the supersonic age with confidence and eagerness.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT PROFIT AND LOWER FARES

(By William A. Patterson, chairman of the board, United Air Lines, Economic Club of Detroit, October 18, 1965)

After 37 years in air transportation—pioneering years with triumphs and disappointments, large and small—I'm beginning to near the end of the long flight. Next April, except for responsibilities as chairman of the board and chairman of our company's executive committee, I plan to become inactive. And the irony of the situation is that my inactivity will begin when the industry is attaining its greatest activity and greatest success.

Now, success is always welcome but I'm a little concerned about its interpretation. I'm sure that some persons—well intentioned but totally unfamiliar with the trials of the past—will view airline profits with an unsympathetic eye. If they had invested toll and time in the development of the air transport industry, they would view its success in a different light.

I've found that time is the great teacher of truth.

We had an unusual illustration of this fact last month when the rulers of Russia decided to place Soviet industry on a profit basis. Repeated failure, want and waste compelled them to repudiate a fundamental part of Marxist doctrine. And the long proclaimed ideal of production for use and not for profit became just another slogan on the scrap heap of history.

Time has forced even the Russian commissars to recognize that profits are essential to progress. Yet, in our country—the world's prime example of economic progress—there are those who regard profits with hostility. They seem to believe that normal healthy returns are rather sinful and that large returns are downright immoral. In their lexicon, as someone has said, profit is a dirty word.

If we could peer into their minds, I think we'd see an outmoded picture of the greedy Fat Man created by cartoonists some years ago. You may recall, he wore a high silk hat, a cutaway coat, and spats. The vest over his ample midsection was decorated with dollar signs and his pudgy fingers glittered with gems. Depending on the times, he was identified as a "capitalist," "the trusts," "profiteer," "monopolist," and "economic royalist."

This fellow became a myth in past years but he can be invoked for many merely by mentioning the word "profit." They immediately think of price gouging, cornered markets, and sand in the sugar. Their vision of silk-hatted swindlers blinds them to the fact that profit is the all-important fuel of our economic engine. Lean out the profit and the engine sputters. Given adequate fuel, it surges ahead over every kind of roadway.

Before condemning any profit, it would seem fair to inquire as to how it was derived and to what use it is put. No right-thinking individual would defend the profit that comes from unethical products and procedures; from grossly underpaid sweat-shop labor; or from contrived scarcities and the manipulations of privately controlled cartels and monopolies.

On the other hand, profit based on good personnel practices, efficient production of a quality product or service, and successful competition in an open market is an accomplishment that society should reward in full. Criticism of such profit as too big or excessive has the flavor of sour grapes.

October 20, 1965

Now as for the use of profit, it is important to consider dividend distribution. Is the payout reasonable in terms of technological advances, the company's present condition and its future competitive position? What part of profit is plowed back into the business for research, refurbishment, modernization and expansion? How much, if any, is diverted for purposes that serve community and nation?

On this last point, I believe that many who have the fat man complex would be surprised by the various end-uses of profit. They can begin their education by examining reports of foundations and philanthropic organizations. A survey of 465 companies several years ago disclosed that their contributions to health and welfare agencies, education, religious causes, and for civil and cultural purposes amounted to \$154 million annually. And that total did not include the donations made by company executives as private individuals.

There are more than 5,000 foundations in this country and, in one way or another, they owe their existence to profit. They bear the names of large and small enterprises, business leaders, and industrialists—Ford, for example, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Alfred P. Sloan.

Not millions but billions in foundation funds have been expended for hospitals, schools, scholarships, medical research, mental health, science, the humanities and arts. Some of us who complain when Government enters social areas that have been neglected can be thankful that part of the slack is taken up by the work of foundations.

In touching on the derivation of profit a few moments ago, I reserved a special type for fuller discussion—the type that includes an element of Government subsidy. Now some may immediately classify such profit as objectionable and I can appreciate their point of view. However, let's examine a particular case, one I'm familiar with—the air transport industry.

The industry had its origin in the mid-1920's, after pilots employed by the U.S. Post Office had demonstrated the feasibility of air mail service. Congress wisely decided to entrust private enterprise with the task of developing a nationwide air transport system. An Air Mail Act, approved in 1925, authorized the post office to transfer its routes to private contractors on the basis of competitive bids.

Three obligations were placed on successful bidders. They were charged with the necessity to develop the art of flying; to establish a market for commercial air transportation; and to attain economic self-sufficiency.

The rates for hauling air mail were sweetened with subsidy, or perhaps I should say seasoned with subsidy, because the dish was not always nourishing. The maximum rate was \$3 a pound but, to win their contract, most operators bid below the maximum and some found out there wasn't enough mail to pay expenses.

One of our predecessor companies, Varney Air Lines, began operations in April 1926. The Varney fleet consisted of six Swallow biplanes. They cruised at 90 miles an hour and, compared with jetliners that cost \$4 to \$6 million, the Swallow could be purchased for \$4,500. Pilots were paid \$250 a month and even this modest salary was sometimes in question because at the outset the Varney route failed to produce enough air mail revenue.

Pacific Air Transport, another of our predecessor companies, also began service in 1926 and also found it hard to make ends meet. The combined revenues of Varney and Pacific Air Transport for 1926 amounted to \$280,000 in mail payments and \$1,530 for carrying passengers.

Coast-to-coast air travel became possible in 1927 but it called for a strong back, an adventurous spirit and \$400 to pay the fare. The trip took about 32 hours—at least, on

paper—and there weren't any inflight movies to pass the time.

Today, you can travel by jet from one coast to the other at a fare 63 percent lower than in 1927 and at a speed increase of well over 500 percent. If the advance in safety, comfort and other intangibles could be expressed mathematically, it would exceed that 500 percent. And as for mail, United now flies a ton of letters a thousand miles for about one-twentieth of what the Post Office paid in the early years.

Seldom have obligations been so abundantly fulfilled. The art of flying has been advanced from propeller planes of wood and canvas to subsonic turbine-powered aircraft that are triumphs of sophisticated technology. In developing a market, the airlines have reached the point where their share of domestic intercity common-carrier traffic is greater than the combined portion of rail and bus.

United became self-sufficient in the late 1940's and the Civil Aeronautics Board certified that fact in January 1951. With only one exception, mail payments of the Nation's 11 trunk lines have not included a dime of subsidy in the last 8 years.

It's a different story for the local service airlines. They operate over routes of lower traffic density, serving smaller cities. Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board believe, air transportation stimulates the economic growth of these communities, and that in all likelihood they'll eventually develop satisfactory traffic volumes. In that expectation, mail subsidy is paid.

When compared with other business operations, the airlines are unique in several ways. They're Government regulated, for example, but intensely competitive. They use very expensive machines to provide a service that's extremely perishable in the sense that a seat unsold when a flight departs cannot be stored and put up for sale again. But the most unusual feature of our business is that from time to time we deliberately render our machines obsolete.

Since World War II, we've gone through round after round of aircraft purchases, advancing from the DC-3 to the jets. Each round has been spurred by competition and the urgency to improve, rather than the necessity to replace something worn out. And each round has resulted in greater safety, speed, and comfort.

In the opening stage of the transition to jet operations, the industry invested \$3½ billion on new aircraft and supporting equipment. This was followed by an outlay of about \$2½ billion for additional planes, including short-haul jets. These expenditures and the industry's great appetite for supplies and materials have created work for an estimated 5,000 factories and jobs for 100,000 manufacturing employees. Since 1960 the Nation's airlines have added 25,000 to their payrolls and the prospect is that 50,000 more will be hired over the next 5 years.

Earnings in the transitional period have been a source of both gloom and encouragement. In 1961 the return on the total trunk-line capital investment was a piddling 1½ percent. That was the low point and the outlook brightened thereafter. Last year the trunkline return was 9½ percent. That's an overall average, incidentally, and it doesn't mean that each company did that well. United's return was around 8 percent—somewhat lower than the 10½ percent established by the Civil Aeronautics Board as fair and reasonable for the major carriers.

In the first 5 years of the jet age, 1959 through 1964, our company invested \$677,569,000 in jets and supporting equipment. Net earnings for those 5 years totaled \$78,400,000, of which 31 percent was paid out in dividends. The remaining 69 percent was retained to improve the business. Earnings accounted for approximately 10 percent of the funds necessary to finance the crucial first step from piston to turbine power.

Huge additional sums had to be raised through sale of debentures and other securities, augmented by depreciation and amortization charges against earnings.

Last April we announced a \$750 million program, covering the purchase, lease and option of 144 more aircraft. They're required to phase out our remaining propeller planes and convert to all-jet operations within 4 years from now. By that time our fleet of 308 jetliners will represent an investment of \$1.6 billion.

That's part of an improvement program unparalleled in the history of transportation or, so far as I know, in general industry. And it's being accomplished without presenting higher and higher bills to the public.

Since 1962 the trunkline average fare per passenger mile has declined by 6 percent. In our company's case, the downturn is even greater. In the last 3 years the average cost per mile to passengers on United has gone from about 6.4 to 5.7 cents, a decrease of 12 percent. In view of the extensive upgrading of service and the tremendous costs of equipment, I believe the industry's achievement in containing fares is little short of extraordinary.

To give specific items, United's fare reductions last year for passengers on certain long haul routes amounted to almost \$6 million. Reductions in the current year, including a change in the family group discount, will save the traveling public approximately \$8 million over a 12-month period.

Apart from fares, our airmail rate was reduced 3 cents per ton-mile last June and in August the basis for determining excess baggage charges was liberalized. A full year of the revised mail rate will save the Post Office about \$2 million. And the new free baggage allowance means that an extra \$3.6 million will be retained annually in the pockets of customers.

The airlines are entering the harvest time of their past efforts to advance and improve. Unquestionably, 1965 will be the industry's best year on every count. United, for example, expects to achieve total operating revenues of approximately \$785 million, as compared with \$669 million in 1964. Passenger revenues should top out around \$705 million, an increase of perhaps 18 percent.

For an industry that was legislated into existence, so to speak, and then nurtured on subsidy until it could stand on its own feet, I think the record is very impressive. Congress, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board can be justifiably proud of a philosophy of government that has encouraged private enterprise to create the best air transport system in the world.

It's one of the outstanding success stories of modern times but it would be misleading to tell you the airlines are going to live happily ever after. There are further challenges to meet, further improvements to undertake. The one that looms largest is the supersonic transport plane.

So far as I can detect, the traveling public isn't clamoring for supersonic speed—at least, domestically—but it nevertheless looks as though our decision will have to be made in the next 18 months. There's a question of national prestige involved and, on the economic level, there's the necessity to maintain this country's leadership in aircraft manufacturing.

Unlike previous types of commercial transports, development of the supersonic plane will not come as a byproduct of military aircraft design and construction. The total expenditure will be astronomical. In terms of the cost per aircraft, each seat on a supersonic plane could well represent an investment of up to \$200,000. In comparison, cost per seat for the finest and fastest piston-engine plane was \$84,000. For the Boeing 707 and the DC-8, it amounted to \$46,000.

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26753

particularly that which is most susceptible to depredation.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

H. B. MONTAGUE,
Chief Inspector.

I do not know the answer to these problems. I do know, however, that I cannot simply join one of my constituents who ended his letter of complaint and frustration by saying:

Sound like a chronic complainer? A person can take just so much and when invited to comment will do so. If you had not inquired, I would have silently borne the burden of many others and said—Oh, well, at least we got it.

From the letters in my file and the numerous complaints which I have heard at meetings and from visitors to my office, he would seem to be one of the lucky ones.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem which does not have a solution. There are problems of varying complexity—and this one is unquestionably one of the more complex. Many factors are undoubtedly involved in the breakdown in service, and the 13th Congressional District has been extremely vocal in pointing out a number of these.

Recently I took occasion to speak on the floor in connection with the civil service and postal pay increase bill which I supported. In part, I discussed one of the problems involved as follows:

What may be a fair wage in one part of this country may not be a fair wage in another part of the country. The 13th District of Illinois, and the area around Chicago, is an area that has a very high cost of living.

There is no question that the postal employees in our area do not make enough at the present time to have a reasonable standard of living. They just do not make enough money. The wages are inadequate. * * * Why has not (a proposal) come before the Congress * * * that takes into account the clear, well-known, and well-publicized differences in the cost of living in the various portions of this country?

I have heard from residents of our district that some postal employees, to augment inadequate incomes, have entered into "house-watching" agreements, whereby they take time from their delivery schedule at each particular house where so requested, and, for a fee, they will enter the house, check the heat and the pets and do other incidental tasks—a pleasant enough service if you are away from the city, but not so pleasant for the family at the end of the route which does not receive its mail until 4:30 in the afternoon, if enough people are out of town that day.

I would take occasion here, too, to object to that time-honored institution—the politically appointed "acting postmaster." Apparently, the proper administration of the postal service is more complicated and more demanding than one might at first be led to believe. The Civil Service Commission was established to prevent deterioration of Government services by appointment of unqualified or inadequately prepared personnel—and yet our postal service is being, in many cases, hastened in its deterioration by this very same type of political appointment.

The appointment of a postmaster lies in the hands of the administration's party—and in more cases than not, the appointment goes to a devoted party worker who—all too often knows little or nothing about the Post Office Department when he takes the job. We then have the convenience of appointing "acting postmasters" who serve indeterminate lengths of time until "postmasters" are finally appointed. Anyone can see that, whether originally qualified or not, if one does the job for 6 months or a year, he or she might very well know the ropes well enough at the end of that time to take the examination and at least end up on the register. And there is the third magic step—almost invariably, if the name of the acting postmaster appears on the register, no matter whether first, or second, or third, he wakes up to find himself postmaster.

I believe politics must leave the postal service. The spoils of political power almost wrecked the Government service until the Civil Service Commission was created. The rewards of faithful political service should not be unrelated positions of public trust. I cannot help but feel empathy for those dedicated, conscientious career employees of the Post Office Department as they watch while one after another takes over the top spot in their particular offices—one after another political appointees who, in many cases, had had little more to do with the post office than buy a stamp or send a package or accept delivery of mail.

In my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I recommended that consideration be given to relieving Members of Congress of responsibilities involving postmasterships and rural letter carriers. I strongly believe that such a step would be in the best interest of the country and of the postal service, as well as of the Congress.

I would be remiss if I did not further point out the inadequacy of existing postal facilities in my district. In some areas studies and surveys and consideration have gone on for years, and the towns—such as Schaumburg, referred to earlier—with populations presently of 5,000 to 6,000 to 7,000 people, cannot even get themselves listed in the postal directory as post offices, branch offices, or stations. In March of 1964, in response to communications from my office and from the village involved, I received the following comments concerning one of our post offices:

There are no present plans for any additional facilities in the community at this time, as it is anticipated that the culmination of plans above mentioned will solve existing difficulties.

Similar problems exist in other townships in northern Cook County.

Mr. Speaker, the plans have been carried through, and the service is worse than it has ever been. Certainly, in this country, we ought to be able to effectively meet the needs of rapidly growing areas—not 3 or 4 or 5 years after growth has taken place, but when it is taking place, or at least immediately thereafter. The continued lag between growth and

service is destructive of efficient mail service.

A review of the amounts of money appropriated for the operations of the Post Office Department over recent fiscal years shows the following: fiscal year 1963, \$4,648,924,300; fiscal year 1964, \$4,925,-500,000; fiscal year 1965, \$5,202 million; fiscal year 1966, \$5,324,400,000—with more to be appropriated. The steady increase is requested and justified year after year on the premise that it is necessary in order to modernize operations and improve service. And still we appropriate more and hope for the best.

And so it goes on. The population increases. The rates increase. The cost of living rises. Facilities do not increase in relation to the population. Service does not increase in relation to rates. Employees do not spend their lives in positions where they do not earn a reasonable wage, and where the incentive to reach the top is taken away before they even start to climb.

Mr. Speaker, if the telephone communications system of this country were operating in this manner, there would be such a public outcry that A.T. & T. would become a Government agency. Thank heaven, and private enterprise, this is not the case. It is not a branch of the Federal Government, and it is making money, expanding operations, reducing rates, and providing efficient modern service. There must be a lesson here somewhere.

The recently appointed Postmaster General, Mr. O'Brien, is a skilled politician and able public servant—which I admire. Let us hope that he will be an equally skilled Postmaster General and be successful in putting the Department back on the track of efficiency and reliability.

*DRAFT YOUNG TOUGHS, PUNKS,
AND HOODLUMS*

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of young persons now considered morally defective or deficient because of criminal records which include juvenile offenses, drunkenness, narcotic addiction, and serious moving traffic infractions. Such persons will receive training and serve in special combat units in the Armed Forces.

In the light of the crisis in Vietnam, I think it is absurd that the Army does not draft our Nation's oversize group of punks and hoods. I am not saying that most of them will be any great shakes as soldiers, but they can at least be of some use as extra manpower.

The Army presently refuses young men with records of juvenile, narcotics, drunkenness, and criminal offenses because it believes they are not morally qualified for the privilege of Army service. This is ridiculous in light of the Vietnam situation. The sooner the Army starts making use of America's large con-

26754

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

tingent of punks and young toughs, the better off we will be. Drafted punks will be good substitutes for persons who can make a greater contribution in other ways, and I personally feel that Army discipline and Army life may have something to offer to the punks and young hoods who now clutter up our streets. No doubt the Army can offer some training that will help rehabilitate young punks and teach the unemployable ones a trade.

I do not believe we can afford to continue drafting only those who satisfy high draft standards because this policy is self-defeating. It drafts those who could make a more valuable contribution elsewhere, and allows those who can make no other contribution and who might profit from service to escape it as morally deficient. The career soldier's concept of the military services as units in which membership is a privilege is inappropriate during wartime or during a period like the Vietnamese crisis. Besides, a unit like the Foreign Legion which took criminals and misfits without question enjoys a reputation as high as most of the best American units.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that punks and criminals who might be drafted under my proposal should be indiscriminately mixed with other soldiers. Most ought to go in special units, and it seems fitting to me that they be combat trained. Individuals with narcotics records particularly ought to be kept apart from other troops. I would suggest special "junkie battalions" for them.

This certainly should cut down our ever-increasing crime rate and make our streets and parks safe again.

PUBLIC REACTION TO RUMP ANTICS ON BANK MERGER BILLS

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a handful of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee made a mockery of the rules of the House by sneaking into the committee room under false pretenses to hold a rump session.

This was a sad performance which hurts the reputation of the entire Congress. The session, of course, was totally illegal. That point has been firmly established.

The rump session did show plainly the desperation behind the move to bail out Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co., the Nation's fourth largest bank, and the other big banks under prosecution for antitrust law violations. That frantic so-called meeting lays bare the massive pressures behind the bank merger bills.

Rice Odell, business editor for the Washington Daily News, tells about this session in today's editions. I place Mr. Odell's column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1965]

DARK PLOTS EMERGE ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Rice Odell)

A pint-sized melodrama, with farcical overtones, was acted out at the Capitol yesterday.

The main plot centered on a bitterly disputed bill before the 33-member House Banking and Currency Committee which would provide retroactive antitrust exemption for three bank mergers, and would also soften merger guidelines to be used by the Justice Department and the courts in the future.

Leading characters in support of the bill are Representatives THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat of Ohio, and WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, backed by Republicans and several other Democrats. In violent opposition is committee chairman, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, and other Democrats. The play begins:

ACT I

The morning before, Mr. Patman has abruptly adjourned a meeting of the committee before a quorum arrived, thereby apparently sounding the death knell of the bill this session. An angry Representative ASHLEY goes into a huddle with Mr. MOORHEAD and one or two others. They plot darkly.

It is a few minutes before 10 a.m. yesterday, and the handsome Mr. MOORHEAD strolls casually through the committee's office toward the hearing room. He is challenged by a member of the staff.

Just going in to pick up some papers I left there, Mr. MOORHEAD is said to have replied.

He enters the cavernous Rayburn Building meeting room, goes to the main door, unlocks it and lets in a dozen or so of his colleagues waiting in the hall. They start to hold a meeting.

Chairman PATMAN has not called it. He doesn't even know about it. In fact he is at the hospital visiting his wife. Mr. ASHLEY, as ranking majority member present, presides. A staff man reported that the lights were all out at the beginning.

Shortly, an opponent of the bill, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, arrives and, with his seniority, claims the chair. He rules immediately that the meeting is illegal.

Aha, says the Ashley-Moorhead group—rule 1 of the committee provides for regular meetings every first and third Tuesday of the month, unless canceled by the chairman. And this he didn't do.

Yes, he did, Mr. REUSS says, and a paper is produced to support the claim. But Mr. REUSS is outvoted and the group continues its meeting, voting favorably on the bank merger bill and to report it to the House.

ACT II

Mr. PATMAN returns, finding what he later calls a "rump session," illegal because he did cancel the regular meeting and also because there was no quorum present.

The Ashley-Moorhead forces issue a press release emphasizing that there was no cancellation, and that there was, indeed, a quorum present. Complete disagreement continues throughout.

Mr. ASHLEY, after the disputed meeting, goes to the House and obtains consent to file the report voted on. Mr. PATMAN says it's not a legal report.

Mr. REUSS calls a press conference to propose a compromise bill which, he says, it's so important Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach should be called to testify.

He said he thinks he can get his proposal to the House "about as fast as that piece of paper that was acted on this morning."

Mr. PATMAN promises to fight the Ashley bill "by all means possible" anyway.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat of Texas, says it must be the "silly season * * * we're acting like a bunch of State legislators."

Another well-known business writer, Lyle Denniston of the Washington Evening Star, also writes a very significant piece for today's editions. As you

will note, the headline sums up the reasons behind the rush for this legislation and the obvious reasons for yesterday's rump session. The headline reads: "Merger Survival Chances Up for Manufacturers, Hanover."

I quote these paragraphs from Mr. Denniston's story:

Chances are gaining that the biggest bank merger ever—the one that joined New York City's Manufacturers Trust Co. and Hanover Bank—will be left undisturbed.

A plan to break up the merged institution is scheduled for filing in a New York Federal court on November 1—less than 2 weeks from now.

But in a confusing round of contradictory action in Congress yesterday may lead to a postponement of the court filing. Such a postponement almost surely will mean that the merger will be saved, even though it was once ruled unlawful by a Federal judge.

Are we, the Congress, to allow an illegal act of a rump session help to overturn a court decision?

I do not believe this is the wish of the majority of the Congress. This would be shameful if true.

As the press has reported, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MOORHEAD, of Pittsburgh, is the Member who sneaked into the Banking and Currency Committee room in the dark, and unlocked the doors. Mr. MOORHEAD has made little secret of his interest in this legislation. Last week, the New York Times carried this significant quote:

Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said the lack of action on the legislation was particularly troublesome for banks, notably the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., in New York, the First National Bank of Lexington, Ky., and the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, which are under court orders to dissolve mergers.

"Courts may take into account the fact that the legislation is almost through Congress," Mr. MOORHEAD said, "but of course this is not certain."

These desperate acts of a handful of Members are putting the whole Congress on trial before the jury of public opinion. I predict that the reaction to yesterday's rump session will be heard for many months to come. I am convinced that the people of the United States do not want their affairs conducted in secret, lawless sessions in darkened committee rooms. The people will speak louder about yesterday's actions than anyone.

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26785

E. WILLIS, our distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and expressed my growing concern over the operation of these clubs and their apparent progress on college campuses throughout the Nation. It is a matter of special apprehension to me that the unrest in several colleges in California, particularly the uprisings at the University of California in Berkeley, have been linked to the activities of Communist groups, and that the Du Bois clubs might be suspected to operate in the forefront of this dissension.

I am convinced that the demonstrations of the past week are representative of the thinking of only a misled, misguided, and misinformed minority of college-age youths, many of them brilliant and idealistic, with energies tragically unchanneled into constructive paths. The very fact that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State should be constrained to comment, and that our Government should need to explain these demonstrations because of their misleading effect upon world opinion, is reason enough for remedial action.

Therefore, it should be mentioned at this time that Chairman WILLIS in August informed me that he too is disturbed by the increase in Communist activity among youth and the particular operations of the W. E. B. du Bois Clubs on campuses, and that a preliminary investigation is underway so that the committee can hold hearings on the organization at the earliest appropriate time.

TOLL TRAPS ON THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which launched our great highway construction program, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to approve toll roads, bridges, or tunnels as part of the Interstate System upon a finding by him that such action would "promote the development of an integrated Interstate System." Pursuant to this act, the Secretary has designated a total of 2,332 miles of toll highways in 23 States as part of the Interstate System. In my opinion, the indiscriminate placing of toll traps on the Interstate System is not in the interest of the public or in keeping with the intent of Congress. This not only violates the concept of a toll-free Federal-Aid Highway System; it also makes road users pay twice—gas taxes and tolls—and adversely influences the planning and construction of needed highway improvements since highway officials try to avoid building highways which would compete with toll facilities.

Some years ago, it was felt by many persons that the building of toll roads in this country would end because of the construction of the 41,000 mile system of

interstate highways. This, however, is not the case. Instead of ending, the building of toll roads is spreading. Some are under construction and a good many more are underway. The August 9, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report has an article on this subject and I quote a part of that article:

In Oklahoma, legislation for five new toll roads recently won approval.

In Kansas, the legislature has called for preliminary studies on three new toll road projects.

In Texas, bonds have just been issued for the State's second stretch of toll highway.

Other new projects are just finished, under construction or study in Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina and Pennsylvania * * *

If all the proposed turnpikes are built, more than a thousand miles will be added to the 3,772 miles of toll road already in operation in the United States.

To be candid, I must point out that so far as I know, none of these new toll facilities are being proposed as additions to the Interstate System. However, under the existing law, they could be added to the system. I do not believe that this would be in accord with the intent of the Congress but a change in the law is needed to preclude such a possibility.

Today, I am introducing a bill to correct this situation. I introduced legislation for the same purpose in the 87th Congress, the 88th Congress, and again early during this Congress. Basically, the previous bills would have required the States to agree not to construct toll facilities on the route of an interstate highway without the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and that the Secretary of Commerce would be required to report to Congress any violation of this agreement. His report would include recommendations as to effective enforcement action to be taken, which action would be carried out unless within 60 days either the House or Senate passed a resolution disapproving his proposed action.

The Department of Commerce, by letter dated July 1, 1965—signed by the general counsel of the Department—commenting on my bill, H.R. 2958, stated that:

While this Department would have no objection to that portion of the bill which would require that all project agreements for projects on the Interstate System contain a clause prohibiting toll facility construction without concurrence therein by the Secretary, the remaining provisions of the bill would not be considered desirable.

In my opinion, H.R. 2958 contained effective desirable provisions which would go far toward correcting the possibility of additional toll traps on the Interstate System. Nevertheless, the chances of having the bill enacted over the objections of the Department of Commerce are remote. Accordingly, I am introducing a new bill which would delete the provisions objected to by the Department of Commerce and retain those parts to which the Department would have no objection. The text of the bill follows and I am hopeful that the Congress will take early and favorable action on the bill.

H.R. 11685

(A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 129, United States Code, is amended by adding the following material after the last sentence of the subsection: "After the date of enactment of this Act, all agreements between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that no toll road, bridge, or tunnel will be constructed on the interstate highway route involved without the official concurrence of the Secretary. The Secretary shall not concur in any such construction unless she shall affirmatively find that, under the particular circumstances existing, the construction of such road, bridge, or tunnel as a toll facility rather than a toll-free facility is in the public interest."

THE KENNEDY ROUND IS THE FOCUS FOR WORLD TRADE PROBLEMS

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 13, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] delivered a speech on the floor of the House entitled "Commercial Policy at the Crossroads: The Kennedy Round Is Focus for Solving Major Trade Problems." Although he outlined many of the problems facing successful trade negotiations at the Kennedy round, his conclusion, which I share, was that with tough bargaining many of our trade goals can be achieved through the Kennedy round.

In the course of his remarks, Congressman CURTIS made another contribution to our understanding of the tactics which must be used by our negotiators. He laid to rest the notion first raised by an article in the October 11 Washington Post, that the United States was tentatively beginning planning to bypass the European Economic Community in some new form of trade arrangement.

The significance of this speech did not go unnoticed in the financial press. Mr. Peter Greenough, financial editor of the Boston Globe, in commenting on the speech in his column of October 14, reiterated the two reasons why this suggested notion to bypass the EEC would be unsound. First, it conflicts directly with the most-favored-nation principle, that duties applied on goods from one country apply to goods from all countries. This cardinal principle of our trade policy cannot be abandoned. Secondly, the rumor ignores the fact that one aim of the Kennedy round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers.

Mr. Greenough continued by saying:

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy round's pulse.

26786

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

CURTIS took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

Greenough concluded that:

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. Tom CURTIS is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

I include the full text of the article from the Boston Globe of October 14 at this point:

VITAL IN TRADE TALKS—IGNORE FRANCE?
NO EASY TASK

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Europe has been chewing on a hot rumor these last few days—that the United States may be contemplating an end-run around France in the Kennedy Round trade talks at Geneva.

The Washington Post started it. The idea, as the Post postulated things, is that we would go ahead and negotiate with other major trading nations and leave the door ajar for the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries to hop aboard later on, once their own internal scrapping had been settled.

Intriguing cocktail talk notion, except for a couple of practical realities.

First, in all our trade relationships there is a key item called the most-favored-nation clause. What it means is that the duties we apply on goods from one major exporting nation apply equally to imports from other sources.

By law, therefore, any two-tiered tariff arrangement would be illegal.

Then, too, the basic aim of the Kennedy Round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers. A strange way it would indeed be to let EEC's duties rise and others fall; the whole ball of wax might unravel.

Moreover, any such move—altogether too crass a piece of diplomatic pressure for any civilized nation—would also represent a major shift in U.S. trade strategy.

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy Round's pulse.

CURTIS took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

To illustrate how ridiculous this notion is in the first place, consider a remark made to the Globe recently by Otmar Emminger, member of the governing board of West German's Central Bank.

In view of the fact that Germany, the United States, and other members of the so-called Group of Ten managed to establish a prop for the British pound without France's help, we asked Emminger if it might be carried further, to the point that a new international monetary setup could be arranged without France's presence?

Emminger vigorously denied it.

By like token, you can apply this same reasoning to the Kennedy round. Increasing of trade and provision for more liquidity (or funds to support trade, in this case) are like Mike 'n Ike. Nothing meaningful could possibly be achieved without France.

Representative CURTIS presently is less optimistic about the Kennedy round's successful outcome than he was last May while visiting Geneva. Nevertheless, he has not reached the degree of despair we have detected here and there.

The first order of business, he suggests, is for everyone to bend themselves toward a successful ending at Geneva. After that we should begin worrying about getting a new trade bill through Congress in 1967.

Conceivably the Congressman is pushing the wrong cart. The way Kennedy round talks drag, it looks as if authority for the United States to be a continuing part of them will be directly up to Congress in another year.

While trade promoters in Washington are about it, they also might start serious thinking on lumping all such efforts under one tent.

State Department (and the Executive) snatched away Congress' prerogative in connection with the Canadian auto parts pact.

Ambassador Christian Herter's office, created specifically to push the Kennedy round, seems to have lost some of its zip (conceivably due to Mr. Herter's ill health).

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. Tom CURTIS is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, these past few days have been filled with comments about the anti-Vietnam demonstrators who have so blatantly used their democratic freedoms to create confusion with respect to the determination of the vast majority of the American people regarding our presence in South Vietnam. The real damage, Mr. Speaker, comes not from their meaningless parades and their defiance of Federal law because these acts and their repulsive connotations are decried by every thinking American. No, their real damage is to the morale of American troops in South Vietnam. Rather than giving attention to the small minority who have seen fit to abuse their freedoms, I would like to reconfirm my gratitude to our boys in Vietnam who are bravely defending the cause of freedom for their generation. Certainly these boys do not like the idea of being in the jungles of Vietnam, but realizing the needs of their country they have accepted orders and displayed courage and valor in what is a seemingly endless battle for the right of men to choose their own government.

It is understandable that there have been some complaints among these soldiers, but those of us who have visited South Vietnam and have had the opportunity to talk with our service people have found a near unanimity of opinion supporting U.S. objectives in this troubled area. These boys realize that we must remain in Vietnam because, as one young man told me, "I would rather fight them here than at home." These boys are risking their lives and dying for the cause of freedom and no amount of irresponsible demonstrating should detract our attention from the service they are rendering to the American people.

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CURTIS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have seen the development of something new in the history of America. It began some months ago in a Midwestern university, when a teach-in was organized by a few members of the faculty and by some of the students, to parade their disagreement with our policies in the Vietnam war.

It has spread since then to a nationally televised teach-in, to a nationally televised debate on Vietnam, to a public burning of draft cards, and now to a threatened march on Washington to protest our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of these actions is one that has many faces.

There is a tradition in our Nation that says that freedom of speech is a sacred thing. Under this great doctrine, the people of America have debated every issue which has come before our Nation. But under it, too, there has grown an equally sacred tradition which says: "When the bullets start to fly, when our men are dying on the battlefield, the voice of America will be one voice that our enemies may hear clearly."

We are not speaking with one voice today. Our enemies are taking great consolation from a small divisive group among us. Daily the newspapers and radio stations behind the Iron Curtain report with glee the divisive influences in America. They are reporting them, not as the voice of a small minority of ill-comprehending youth and ill-advised professors, but as the voice of America—and they are deceiving themselves and their peoples in so reporting.

Out of this deceit may well come a prolongation of the war in Vietnam. Out of it may well come a new toll of death among our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our airmen, who are fighting with bravery in one of the most difficult wars in the history of our Nation.

There is another tragedy to this which I must point out. It has long been true that trouble catches the headlines. So on the front pages of the papers of the Nation last Sunday there were headlines screaming about the parades and teach-ins protesting our involvement in Vietnam. It was not readily apparent from the reading of the headlines that the group involved was pitifully small. These headlines went to our men in Vietnam, the men who were marching out into the jungle or flying over North Vietnam in furtherance of our war effort; and as they marched out to possible death or torture, they could read their own noble commitments being denounced by fellow Americans.

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26787

It is difficult to speak in reasoned tones about these incidents. There is a swelling tide of anger in America over them, and I am one of those who has become angry.

It has been the tradition, not of America alone, but of the whole history of civilization that our teachers should lead the young into the paths of truth and righteousness. We have a tradition of teaching in America that has produced great minds, great souls, even noble souls. It is a monumental tragedy that a very small portion of our teachers in 1965 have lost sight of that tradition.

In the current Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists there is an article by Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding, who presided over the first teach-in at the University of Michigan. It is an article which is designed to show how splendidly and intelligently the teach-in was conducted, and how brilliantly it was geared to the Vietnamese war. But it is monumentally tragic that the essay on self praise spoke no one word about the vast problem of facing a Communist power in China which is pledged to dominate Asia, and eventually the world—through violence. There is no word about the thousands and thousands of murders committed by the Vietcong. There is no word about the ultimate question: Just what would happen to the people of South Vietnam if we did get out?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the teachers involved in these teach-in programs to look to themselves again. If they are looking for sensationalism, then I believe they are in the wrong profession. Teaching is supposed to be a quiet search for truth. I do not believe these teach-ins are pursuing eternal verities.

There are nearly 150,000 of our brave men presently committed to the fight to save the people of South Vietnam from Communist slavery. We have made a pledge to save them. We must keep it, in the name of all that is sacred to our own traditions, and in the name of basic human decency.

It is not possible for me to be with our troops in Vietnam to tell them that America stands beside them in their fight, in our fight. But I would consider myself remiss if I did not state this in the Halls of Congress, where the men and women who represent the Nation may speak.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the cruel stupidity of the teach-in may soon become evident to the foolish teachers and the misguided students who are engaging in this work to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that the agents of our Federal Government will take swift and proper action against those people who are destroying their draft cards as their protest against our involvement in Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word about the proposed march on Washington. I have not bothered to note the date of this proposed march. I have no intention of noting the date. I merely wish to note that I shall not be in my office to meet any marchers coming to Washington. I hope none come from among

the great patriots in my own 10th Congressional District, where my constituents know the meaning of this war, and know they must stand solidly with our fighting men. In any event, I have no desire to see any marchers, to discuss anything with any marchers. I shall make a conscious effort to be absent when they arrive. I have nothing to discuss with them. I would, however, suggest that if they really need conversation, they travel into the central highlands of Vietnam, to discuss their problems with our soldiers and marines in the jungles. That conservation should be profitable for them.

CRISIS IN OUR FISCAL POLICY

(Mr. McDADE was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are facing this year something of a crisis in our fiscal policy. We have voted the largest budget in the history of the Nation. No one can be unaware of the importance of saving wherever saving is possible. We have called upon the Departments of the Federal Government to exercise the wisest prudence in their expenditures. We have called upon them to do so in the past.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to report in this House that in the person of Mr. Frank C. Memmott, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, there is one man who is well aware of the need to save money and who is doing something about it today just as he did something about it yesterday. At my request, Mr. Memmott has made available to me certain documents and directives originating in the Bureau of Mines which are specifically aimed at saving as much money as possible. I am inserting those directives in the RECORD at this point for all of you to read:

APRIL 26, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.

From: Director.

Subject: Convention and foreign travel.

Travel to conventions and foreign countries to attend meetings of technical societies is worthwhile and the Bureau of Mines should be represented at the meetings where a definite benefit from such attendance is

clearly demonstrable. However, the number of requests for convention and foreign travel being received for approval leads me to believe that insufficient thought is given by the persons involved to the need for the requested travel.

There has been and continues to be increased emphasis by the Congress on reduction of travel expenses of Government employees. Furthermore, it is the announced policy of President Johnson and Secretary Udall to utilize our manpower to the fullest extent in order to advance our technical programs as rapidly as possible with available funds. Personnel attending foreign sponsored meetings and conventions without good cause are not being utilized fully.

Supervisors at all levels of operation should carefully consider all applications for convention and foreign travel and forward only those which appear to fit the criteria for serious need for attendance. I am personally interested in making an all-out effort to reduce travel expenses to a minimum and owing to the comparatively large expense involved in both convention and foreign travel this naturally is an item which will bear close scrutiny.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Director.

APRIL 20, 1965.

To: Director, through Assistant Director, Health and Safety.

From: Chief, Division of Coal Mine Inspection.

Subject: Reducing cost of travel.

On April 7, 1965, I attended a conference with officials of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. and health and safety district D, Bureau of Mines, at the company's office, West Frankfort, Ill. When the conference was arranged, we anticipated that it would not be concluded until late in the afternoon which meant the only available return flight would be at 7:45 a.m., April 8, from Evansville, Ind.—a 2-hour drive from West Frankfort.

Inasmuch as we were able to complete the conference before 12 noon on April 7, I contacted the Eastern Air Lines office in Evansville and arranged to change my flight time from 7:45 a.m., April 8, to 3:30 p.m., April 7. My scheduled flight at 7:45 a.m. on April 8 returning from Evansville, Ind., was first class, the only available accommodation on that flight. Inasmuch as I was able to obtain tourist-class accommodations on the return flight on the afternoon of April 7, a saving of \$10.70 in air fare and a saving of \$8 per diem was realized.

I am giving you this statement to prove that we are quite sincere in our efforts to cut costs wherever possible.

H. F. WEAVER.

Control of travel

	Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Budget	Cost	Percent	Budget	Cost	Percent
Administration.....	\$93,400	\$65,694	70.3	\$93,710	\$62,573	66.7
Mineral resource development.....	271,700	221,375	81.4	279,090	183,787	65.8
Minerals research.....	402,500	356,491	88.5	389,500	325,525	83.5
Health and safety.....	336,900	355,054	105.3	366,800	308,575	84.1
Helium.....	61,300	53,676	87.5	85,900	62,755	73.0
Total.....	1,165,800	1,032,290	88.5	1,215,000	943,215	77.6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.

From: Director.

Subject: Travel.

You are aware of my insistence that every Bureau of Mines official charged with the responsibility of approving travel exercise prudence and care in the expenditure of such

funds. With your cooperation, in fiscal year 1965 we did a good job of restricting travel only to those trips we considered absolutely essential for conduct of the Bureau's business. During the 1966 fiscal year, I am again soliciting your help in exercising a tight control over the expenditures of the Bureau's travel funds. One way to accomplish our goal is for you to alert all members of your

26788

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

staff to review carefully their requirements and plans for travel.

With respect to travel by assistant directors, starting immediately I will expect an absence from the office notice (form 6-536) to be on my desk at least 5 days before a proposed trip. In certain emergencies where such notification is impossible, verbal notice should be given if practical. I will expect the absence form to be prepared in enough detail to provide me with full information regarding the purpose of the trip.

Similar procedures should be set up for the personnel under your direction.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1965.
To: Assistant Directors, Headquarters Division
Chiefs, Area Directors, Research
Center Directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

We are all well aware of our obligation to carefully and continuously monitor our travel commitments. In addition to our efforts in this direction and the concern expressed by the congressional committees, President Johnson and Secretary Udall, personally, have directed that travel be restricted to those instances that are clearly essential to the effective performance of the Government's most urgent programs.

The obligation to conform to this policy attaches to all persons to whom authority has been delegated to approve travel, as well as to their supervisors. The funds allotted to offices, laboratories, and projects are controlled by objects and we know that each supervisor establishes his work plans with the limitations on such objects as travel in mind.

Aside from the travel that is essential to the effective conduct and management of the Bureau's specifically authorized projects and programs, it is expected that our presence at certain public affairs, meetings and conventions is necessary to maintain appropriate Government, public, and industry relationships and to gain the scientific and commercial knowledge that is important to the planning and conduct of our work. But the fact remains that the total funds available for travel is fixed and we are expected to not only perform all of our obligations within that total but to implement controls that insure that expenditures are well below it.

This year a number of new national programs of particular significance, such as the wilderness investigations and the scrap studies, involves the need for extensive travel on the part of numerous people. Moreover, travel that is essential and clearly necessary to the conduct and management of our continuing research and investigative programs involves substantial expenditures. In approving travel for other purposes each of us recognizes that funds remaining for the conduct of our authorized work are reduced by a like amount. Therefore, in contemplating travel for any purpose, each of us must, in his own mind, be completely satisfied that his decision is correct.

In weighing the merits of individual instances of travel, ultimate approval of foreign trips rests with the Secretary and, in other cases, with this office. We expect in these instances that appropriate judgment has been exercised by the originator of the request as well as the supervising offices. The fact that approval might rest elsewhere in no sense relieves the proposed traveler of his obligation to objectively determine what the cost means in terms of our total obligations and if it is clearly essential.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my own personal commendation to Mr. Memmott

for his work in this direction. I hope that every Director in every section of the Federal Government will take note of his fine activities and will go and do likewise. It is certainly an effort that is well worth the commendation of this entire body.

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROLE

(Mr. ASHBROOK was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a very incisive editorial in their October 20 edition. It deals with the 5th amendment testimony of Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I heard his entire testimony—or possibly I should say his lack thereof—and it is quite a contrast compared to his previous invective and loud talk. Like most demagogues, he issued a plios and self-serving declaration afterwards that he was fighting for freedom and so forth. He isn't fighting for freedom, Mr. Speaker. By his own admission he is fighting to prevent the Negro from attaining his constitutional rights and protections.

It is quite ironic that he should endeavor to use the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in his declinations to respond to questions dealing with everything from his title to mismanagement of funds. He is dead set against the Negro achieving any rights through the equal protection clause but he certainly found it a safe sanctuary for the time being. I am hopeful that we will be cited for Contempt of Congress. The Daily News editorial hits the nail right on the head, and it follows:

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROBE

The U.S. Constitution surely is one of the most wondrous protective garments ever conceived by man. It shields alike the innocent and the guilty, the sheep and the wolf, the accuser and the accused.

Now it gathers under its capacious skirts even the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

This in itself is irony of high degree. For the Constitution and its amendments are repugnant to every tenet and every trapping of the Klan.

Yet Mr. Robert Shelton, who heads the United Klans of America, has found the Constitution a more comfortable garment in which to wrap himself than the robe and hood of his organization.

He invoked not only the 5th but also the 1st, 4th, and 14th amendments to avoid giving the House Un-American Activities Committee any information about the Klan. It was an interesting selection, to say the least.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of assembly and of petition for redress of grievances. Do Klansmen believe in these freedoms for Negroes, for Catholics, for Jews, for anyone who opposes them?

The fourth amendment safeguards the right of people to be secure against search and seizure except under full color of the law. Do Klansmen wait for warrants before starting on midnight forays?

The fifth amendment does more than protect a person against self-incrimination. It further pledges that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Do the noose and the whip, the torch and the gun comprise due process of law?

The 14th amendment's use in this instance is most ironic of all. It guarantees full citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States—including Negroes—and forbids States to pass laws abridging this privilege. Was it not to thwart the purposes of this amendment that the Ku Klux Klan was born?

Mr. Shelton, of course, has the privilege of invoking these or any other constitutional provisions if he wishes. As a citizen, he is under the protection of the Constitution no matter what he may think of its application to others. So are his fellow Klansmen.

But the American people will form their own opinion of men who hide behind constitutional immunity as readily as they hide behind robes and hoods.

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BROTHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [MR. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., entitled, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer. The author's background and qualifications were described thus:

Robert Scheer is coauthor with Maurice Zeitlin of the book, "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere." A correspondent for Ramparts and the Realist, Mr. Scheer has recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia.

Later I received an appraisal of the report, plus a much more generous rundown on Mr. Scheer's background, from another recipient of the report, the Honorable RICHARD H. ICCHORD, of Missouri, who is my colleague on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He made an excellent reply to the letter we both received.

Because it is virtually impossible for a congressional office to thoroughly digest all informative materials which it regularly receives, the following insertions should prove useful in evaluating the report, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam":

LETTER OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD ICCHORD

Recently I received from you a copy of "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer, which you described as "the best short treatment of this subject I have ever seen." After a very thorough reading of the material, I must strongly disagree with your conclusion.

The publication is filled with half-truths, distortions, implications, innuendoes, and inferences which lead one to believe that Ho Chi Minh is the George Washington of Vietnam and any American who has had any part in our involvement is guilty of stopping a legitimate revolution. For example, in the section entitled "The Lobby," Mr. Scheer

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26789

implies that our involvement in Vietnam was the result of a plot carried out by such distinguished Americans as JOHN F. KENNEDY, MAURINE NEUBERGER, EDNA KELLEY, EMANUEL CELLER, and Cardinal Spellman. I would also point out to you that the Fund For The Republic, which allegedly sponsored the publication of the material, has been denounced by the very people who provided the money for its establishment.

I am equally confident that you were also unaware of Mr. Scheer's previous efforts in behalf of the Vietcong, Fidel Castro, and Mao Tse Tung.

I enclose a brief résumé of Mr. Scheer's activities which I am also sending to all Members of Congress for their information. I am sending this to them as I believe they should be informed of the kind of material being printed and distributed by an alleged education organization which enjoys a tax-exempt status. I, of course, am sending it only to the Members who received a copy from you.

With warmest personal regard, I am

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

ENCLOSURE PREPARED BY REPRESENTATIVE
ICHORD ON ROBERT SCHEER

(The following is a brief résumé of the previous activities of Mr. Robert Scheer, based on documented evidence held in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.)

1. Robert Scheer is a former executive committee member of the University of California at Berkeley chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

2. Robert Scheer has traveled to Vietnam. He appeared as an introductory speaker at a showing of the film entitled "War in Vietnam." The film was prepared by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, "Vietcong," and was confiscated by Federal authorities in New York.

3. Robert Scheer was among the first students to violate the Cuban travel ban. An investigation of this travel by the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicated the trip was financed to a large degree by a foreign power. While in Cuba, the students cheered at a film showing American aircraft being shot down.

4. Robert Scheer's book "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere," damns the U.S. policies and defies Fidel Castro.

5. Robert Scheer was among those who signed a petition urging President Kennedy to adopt a fairer policy toward Cuba.

6. Robert Scheer is actively engaged in the programs of the Women's Strike for Peace and appears in their "demonstrations," including the massive march in Times Square, New York City, coinciding with the march on Washington.

7. The following are but a few of the many quotes attributed to Robert Scheer: "We cannot expect Jack Kennedy to feel the necessity of political freedom—he has never been threatened by the state, never questioned by the secret police (FBI), never seen his parents arrested as political prisoners."

"You must talk about the economic development of Communist China and the role of profit in the perversion of the American consumer."

"As imperfect as they may be, Nasser, Mao, Toure, and Castro have liberated their people for the first time in modern history and we as a people oppose them."

8. Robert Scheer is an announced participant in the coming international days of protest on October 15 and 16 which is sponsored by the Vietnam day committee. This is the committee which attempted to halt the troop trains in California.

(Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ADDABBO'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FENCING AND SPRAYING POSE DUAL THREAT TO ANTELOPE ON PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS

(Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the welfare of antelope herds on our federally owned public grazing lands in the West. I warned earlier that the erection of thousands of miles of fences on these public lands inhibited the movement of antelope herds which must range widely for the food and water they need to survive.

This concern prompted me on September 30, 1965, to introduce H.R. 11359, a bill to prohibit the erection of fences which impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing and other purposes.

On October 9, 1965, the Bureau of Land Management issued a position statement on its fencing policy on publicly owned lands in the West. I discussed this statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1965, pages 26092-26094—and reported that I was encouraged that the BLM was recommending a tightening of its fencing policy.

The threat to antelope posed by the network of fences on publicly owned grazing lands—over 6,100 miles of such fencing has been erected in Wyoming alone—is described in an excellent article in the October 15 issue of Conservation News, a publication of the National Wildlife Federation.

The article points out that the BLM and livestock operators have embarked on still another program that could cut down on the antelope population—aircraft spraying to kill sagebrush. Cattle and sheep do not eat the hardy plant, but it is a staple in the antelope's diet.

Since an estimated two-thirds of our antelope live on public lands administered by the BLM, it follows that the Bureau's policy on management of this land will play an important role in determining the future of antelope herds.

Congress originally directed the BLM to manage these public lands for multiple uses, including livestock production, wildlife habitat, recreation and timber production.

The Conservation News article implies that this directive is not being followed by the BLM.

I include a copy of the article by Willard T. Johns, Assistant Chief of the Division of Conservation Education of the National Wildlife Federation:

WHERE THE LIVESTOCK, BUT NOT THE ANTELOPE, CAN PLAY

(By Will Johns)

The West, according to the popular ballad, is supposed to be the place where seldom

is heard a discouraging word and the deer and the antelope play.

Not any more. At least not in Wyoming where the hottest controversy in years is boiling up among conservationists, sportsmen, ranchers, and the Bureau of Land Management. At stake is the future of the pronghorn antelope, America's only genuine and distinct mammal—a species which has no living relatives in any other part of the world.

The fleet-footed, graceful and colorful pronghorn antelope is a creature of the prairies and wide-open spaces. It once ranged over an area of 2 million square miles in the central part of the continent—north into Canada, south into Mexico, east to Iowa and west to Oregon, Washington, and some parts of California. Some estimates of its numbers in the early 1800's ran as high as 30 to 40 million animals. But less than 75 years later, a 2-year survey in 1922-24 by State and Federal conservation agencies revealed that only about 26,600 antelope were left in the 16 Western States. It looked like the end of the pronghorn as a game animal and almost all of the States moved quickly to close the seasons and give the antelope full legal protection. Within 30 years, however, the antelope came back. Between 1924 and 1957, Wyoming's antelope herd increased from less than 7,000 to 105,000; in Montana from about 3,000 to 59,000; in Arizona from about 650 to more than 9,000. Today, surveys indicate antelope herds on the remaining range may total over 300,000 animals.

Now, however, the fate of the antelope rests not so much with the hunter as it does with other users of its range, especially with Government agencies which control those uses. Today, it is not the hunting rifle that poses a threat to the welfare of these popular and important animals; rather, the doom of the antelope may well be determined by the erection of fences and the application of herbicides on its home on the range.

As with all wild birds and animals, habitat is the key to antelope abundance. But unlike many game animals, antelope habitat has but two simple characteristics—plenty of sagebrush and plenty of wide open space. Over most of its present range, these two simple requirements are also characteristics of federally owned land in the Western States—land still left in the public domain and administered by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management through its State directors and advisory boards. Indeed, two out of every three pronghorn antelope alive today are found on lands administered by this single Bureau.

Here is where the fate of the antelope hangs in the balance—a balance of uses for the public domain. Until fairly recently, there was little, if any, conflict but today new techniques and new materials spell the beginning of a rapid change. From pioneer days, the greatest single use of these lands has been (and still is) the grazing of sheep and cattle. It is a land use upon which a rich and powerful industry has been built and for years, many livestock operators have considered grazing to be the only use for which these lands are suited.

Fortunately for antelope, there has been no great problem in their sharing the range with cattle or sheep. Occasionally a feeling of resentment cropped up among some ranchers who felt the antelope were competing with their cattle or sheep for the available forage. Wildlife biologists, however, long since have proved that with proper stocking rates of domestic livestock and game there is little competition for specific food plants.

Still another ballad expressing the feeling of the old West contained the line, "Don't fence me in." And, until recent years, most of the people and all of the antelope felt that fences on the open range were too costly and really unnecessary. Where some control

26790

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

or watchfulness over flocks of sheep or herds of cattle was necessary, livestock operators used cowboys or shepherders. Today, however, most of the cowboys and other "riders of the purple sage" are seen only on television, at dude ranches, or in rodeos. Control of grazing now is beginning to take the form of fences—wire fences strung mile after mile across the range in order to divide grazing units and keep sheep and cattle off the highways. These fences do keep livestock within well-defined areas, of course, and do eliminate the cost of hiring men to watch over them. But for the antelope, fences pose a serious problem. Unlike deer and other big game, antelope normally are not good high jumpers. Some pronghorns do have the ability to get across fences, even when running at full speed (up to 50 miles per hour) by projecting themselves through or under the strands of barbed wire. Most adults in time have learned how to jump over a 4-foot fence but many are still lost where fences corner during severe snowstorms. Young antelope, however, usually wind up entangled in the wire or are completely blocked from traditional migration routes.

Coupled with fencing is another, and equally serious, problem. In Wyoming, as in many other places, much of the public domain has been badly overgrazed. The better forage grasses are gone, the top soil eroded away, and about the only plant that can survive is the tough sagebrush. Thus the Bureau of Land Management and the livestock operators are embarked on a major range rehabilitation program. Many techniques have been tried but currently the most popular, and least expensive, seems to be aerial spraying of the herbicide 2,4-D in an oil suspension. The objective is to kill out the sagebrush, then reseed the range in the hope that it will come back to grasses and other forage for livestock. The only hitch is that in many places the only top soil left is the little bit held together under the sagebrush plants. When they are destroyed, wind or water erosion sweeps that soil away and no amount of reseeding will ever bring back suitable forage cover. One study in Montana, for example, showed that after a sagebrush spraying program had been completed, the grass cover increased only 1 percent.

With this background, it is not too difficult to understand the concern of Wyoming sportsmen, as well as that of conservationists everywhere, over current fencing and spraying programs in the "Equality State." In the Bench Corral area of Sublette County north of Big Piney, for example, the Bureau of Land Management has announced it plans to spray 2,4-D to kill out sagebrush on over half of the 64,000 acres in the next 8 years. Already, BLM has sprayed 5,000 acres and has scheduled application of the herbicide next year in the most important antelope fawning area on the Bench Corral. Three years ago, according to Wyoming Game Warden Dave Thomas, the antelope population on the Bench Corral totaled 530 animals. Last year BLM started, or permitted holders of grazing allotments to start, a fence building program as well as spraying to eradicate the sagebrush. The May 1965, spring census showed the antelope population had dropped to 437 and 5 weeks after the spraying of 5,000 acres, the count was 168 animals. Thomas points out that the spray doesn't actually kill the antelope, but it apparently does drive them out of the area and scatters them in small herds from which they don't seem to regroup.

Another "hot spot" in the controversy is located in the Rattlesnake Mountains on some 20,000 acres known as the Cabin Creek Allotment. This includes 18,240 acres of Federal land administered by BLM, 770 acres of State land, and 1,670 acres of deeded land. It was formerly operated by the Grieve fam-

ily as the Diamond Ring Ranch, with cattle using the allotment. When the ranch was sold several years ago, the new owner applied to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to graze both cattle and sheep on the land, as well as permission to construct about 30 miles of sheep-tight fencing. Permission to graze sheep was granted. The Bureau, however, has an agreement of long standing with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to consult with it before authorizing any fences on the public land. In this case, the department refused to give approval because the fencing would be detrimental to the antelope. Last summer, however, a survey of this area showed that the 30 miles of fence had been erected on the public domain without permission from BLM, the Wyoming department, or anyone else. To date, the fence is still up although affidavits have been filed against the Diamond Ring Ranch Company in the hope that the U.S. attorney will file a civil suit compelling the firm to tear it down.

To resolve a growing problem and insure the future of antelope in Wyoming, Tom Bell, president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, has called for a 10-point program, as follows:

1. An indefinite moratorium on sheep-tight fence on the public domain where antelope are involved.

2. Fencing on all important antelope ranges should be kept to a minimum. Where fences are absolutely necessary, they should be no more than a four-strand wire fence, with the bottom wire no less than 16 inches above ground level.

3. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the effects on antelope of fences now in place.

4. A review of grazing fees, with the thought in mind that where minimum fences only are permitted, the fees would remain low; otherwise, where the public is subsidizing the building of fences, the fees would be scaled upward.

5. A modification of a number of fences lying on or across critical migration routes of antelope where these are known, the modification to be as above.

6. A posting of all roads on all lands in grazing districts where there is an interspersal of private and public lands. If the public allows grazing on its land, the private landowner should certainly allow access across theirs.

7. Immediate prosecution of any unauthorized fences and illegal signs.

8. Immediate installation of livestock "exclosures," 5 to 10 acres in size, on the public range in order to determine range rehabilitation through natural processes and then to compare results with present livestock allotments.

9. Immediate implementation of methods to obtain better control of livestock numbers on the public range. There is really no excuse for livestock owners receiving only a light slap on the wrist for consistently overstocking and overgrazing, and for willful trespass.

10. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the long-range effect of sagebrush spraying on all the ecological communities involved.

Echoes of the fight to save the antelope in the "Equality State" are now spreading across the Nation. They sounded through Pinedale in late August when the National Wildlife Federation's officers, staff and board of directors pledged support of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation's stand and carried the plea to save the pronghorn into the Washington offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

This conservation battle is far from over but it reached a new level of intensity on September 30 when Representative HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H.R.

11359) in the 89th Congress. The REUSS bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to ban from the public lands any fence which impedes the movement of wildlife. If the Secretary finds a grazing licensee has built such a fence, he shall require it to be removed by the licensee, and shall see that it is removed at the licensee's expense if the licensee fails to remove it himself within 30 days. Any future illegal fencing shall be the cause for a revocation of the grazing license.

As storm clouds gather over the home on the range for antelope, livestock, fences and sprayed sagebrush, one point should be made clear. This is not a fight for a single use of the public domain, but rather a fight based on the principle of multiple use—a principle which by law and regulation is supposed to be applied to all of the 18 million acres in Wyoming and 176 million acres in the 11 Western States administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Sportsmen of the Equality State and conservationists throughout the Nation are asking that the antelope be given equal consideration, along with cattle, sheep, horses and other creatures, both wild and domesticated, which live where the buffalo once roamed and the skies are not cloudy all day.

THE SUGAR BILL

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 13 on the floor of the House we debated the sugar bill. I felt that the people in my district were entitled to information that would give them a true picture of what transpired and I therefore sent out on that day the following radio press release. I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

There has been a good deal of comment both in and out of Congress regarding the recently passed sugar bill. Most of this rhetoric has been by persons who are more interested in generating heat than they are in bringing light on this subject.

Heat in itself is not necessarily bad, because as President Truman is reported to have said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Unfortunately, however, numerous scurrilous and character defamation remarks were directed toward members of the Committee on Agriculture. This was uncalled for and was not worthy of the proper debate that should be observed in the House of Representatives.

It pleased me greatly to see a large number of Members from both sides of the aisle rise to the defense of members of this capable committee. In order to keep the record straight, I hope all who are interested in this debate will study carefully the entire text as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would be a grave mistake to rely only on the fragmentary and out-of-context reports that so readily abound.

This committee has worked long and hard on some excellent farm legislation. It would be tragic if we were to allow irresponsible comments to cloud the issue and detract from the work of these conscientious Members of Congress.

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

26788

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 20, 1965

staff to review carefully their requirements and plans for travel.

With respect to travel by assistant directors, starting immediately I will expect an absence from the office notice (form 6-536) to be on my desk at least 5 days before a proposed trip. In certain emergencies where such notification is impossible, verbal notice should be given if practical. I will expect the absence form to be prepared in enough detail to provide me with full information regarding the purpose of the trip.

Similar procedures should be set up for the personnel under your direction.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1965.
To: Assistant Directors, Headquarters Division
Chiefs, Area Directors, Research
Center Directors.

From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

We are all well aware of our obligation to carefully and continuously monitor our travel commitments. In addition to our efforts in this direction and the concern expressed by the congressional committees, President Johnson and Secretary Udall, personally, have directed that travel be restricted to those instances that are clearly essential to the effective performance of the Government's most urgent programs.

The obligation to conform to this policy attaches to all persons to whom authority has been delegated to approve travel, as well as to their supervisors. The funds allotted to offices, laboratories, and projects are controlled by objects and we know that each supervisor establishes his work plans with the limitations on such objects as travel in mind.

Aside from the travel that is essential to the effective conduct and management of the Bureau's specifically authorized projects and programs, it is expected that our presence at certain public affairs, meetings and conventions is necessary to maintain appropriate Government, public, and industry relationships and to gain the scientific and commercial knowledge that is important to the planning and conduct of our work. But the fact remains that the total funds available for travel is fixed and we are expected to not only perform all of our obligations within that total but to implement controls that insure that expenditures are well below it.

This year a number of new national programs of particular significance, such as the wilderness investigations and the scrap studies, involves the need for extensive travel on the part of numerous people. Moreover, travel that is essential and clearly necessary to the conduct and management of our continuing research and investigative programs involves substantial expenditures. In approving travel for other purposes each of us recognizes that funds remaining for the conduct of our authorized work are reduced by a like amount. Therefore, in contemplating travel for any purpose, each of us must, in his own mind, be completely satisfied that his decision is correct.

In weighing the merits of individual instances of travel, ultimate approval of foreign trips rests with the Secretary and, in other cases, with this office. We expect in these instances that appropriate judgment has been exercised by the originator of the request as well as the supervising offices. The fact that approval might rest elsewhere in no sense relieves the proposed traveler of his obligation to objectively determine what the cost means in terms of our total obligations and if it is clearly essential.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my own personal commendation to Mr. Memmott

for his work in this direction. I hope that every Director in every section of the Federal Government will take note of his fine activities and will go and do likewise. It is certainly an effort that is well worth the commendation of this entire body.

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROLE

(MR. ASHBROOK was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a very incisive editorial in their October 20 edition. It deals with the 5th amendment testimony of Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I heard his entire testimony—or possibly I should say his lack thereof—and it is quite a contrast compared to his previous invective and loud talk. Like most demagogues, he issued a pious and self-serving declaration afterwards that he was fighting for freedom and so forth. He isn't fighting for freedom, Mr. Speaker. By his own admission he is fighting to prevent the Negro from attaining his constitutional rights and protections.

It is quite ironic that he should endeavor to use the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in his declinations to respond to questions dealing with everything from his title to mismanagement of funds. He is dead set against the Negro achieving any rights through the equal protection clause but he certainly found it a safe sanctuary for the time being. I am hopeful that we will be cited for Contempt of Congress. The Daily News editorial hits the nail right on the head, and it follows:

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROBE

The U.S. Constitution surely is one of the most wondrous protective garments ever conceived by man. It shields alike the innocent and the guilty, the sheep and the wolf, the accuser and the accused.

Now it gathers under its capacious skirts even the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

This in itself is irony of high degree. For the Constitution and its amendments are repugnant to every tenet and every trapping of the Klan.

Yet Mr. Robert Shelton, who heads the United Klans of America, has found the Constitution a more comfortable garment in which to wrap himself than the robe and hood of his organization.

He invoked not only the 5th but also the 1st, 4th, and 14th amendments to avoid giving the House Un-American Activities Committee any information about the Klan. It was an interesting selection, to say the least.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of assembly and of petition for redress of grievances. Do Klansmen believe in these freedoms for Negroes, for Catholics, for Jews, for anyone who opposes them?

The fourth amendment safeguards the right of people to be secure against search and seizure except under full color of the law. Do Klansmen wait for warrants before starting on midnight forays?

The fifth amendment does more than protect a person against self-incrimination. It further pledges that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due proc-

ess of law. Do the noose and the whip, the torch and the gun comprise due process of law?

The 14th amendment's use in this instance is most ironic of all. It guarantees full citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States—including Negroes—and forbids States to pass laws abridging this privilege. Was it not to thwart the purposes of this amendment that the Ku Klux Klan was born?

Mr. Shelton, of course, has the privilege of invoking these or any other constitutional provisions if he wishes. As a citizen, he is under the protection of the Constitution no matter what he may think of its application to others. So are his fellow Klansmen.

But the American people will form their own opinion of men who hide behind constitutional immunity as readily as they hide behind robes and hoods.

(MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

[MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [MR. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of the Fund For the Republic, Inc., entitled, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer. The author's background and qualifications were described thus:

Robert Scheer is coauthor with Maurice Zeitlin of the book, "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere." A correspondent for Ramparts and the Realist, Mr. Scheer has recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia.

Later I received an appraisal of the report, plus a much more generous rundown on Mr. Scheer's background, from another recipient of the report, the Honorable RICHARD H. ICCHORD, of Missouri, who is my colleague on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He made an excellent reply to the letter we both received.

Because it is virtually impossible for a congressional office to thoroughly digest all informative materials which it regularly receives, the following insertions should prove useful in evaluating the report, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam":

LETTER OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD ICCHORD
Recently I received from you a copy of "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer, which you described as "the best short treatment of this subject I have ever seen." After a very thorough reading of the material, I must strongly disagree with your conclusion.

The publication is filled with half-truths, distortions, implications, innuendoes, and references which lead one to believe that Ho Chi Minh is the George Washington of Vietnam and any American who has had any part in our involvement is guilty of stopping a legitimate revolution. For example, in the section entitled "The Lobby," Mr. Scheer

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26787

It is difficult to speak in reasoned tones about these incidents. There is a swelling tide of anger in America over them, and I am one of those who has become angry.

It has been the tradition, not of America alone, but of the whole history of civilization that our teachers should lead the young into the paths of truth and righteousness. We have a tradition of teaching in America that has produced great minds, great souls, even noble souls. It is a monumental tragedy that a very small portion of our teachers in 1965 have lost sight of that tradition.

In the current Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists there is an article by Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding, who presided over the first teach-in at the University of Michigan. It is an article which is designed to show how splendidly and intelligently the teach-in was conducted, and how brilliantly it was geared to the Vietnamese war. But it is monumentally tragic that the essay on self praise spoke no one word about the vast problem of facing a Communist power in China which is pledged to dominate Asia, and eventually the world—through violence. There is no word about the thousands and thousands of murders committed by the Vietcong. There is no word about the ultimate question: Just what would happen to the people of South Vietnam if we did get out?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the teachers involved in these teach-in programs to look to themselves again. If they are looking for sensationalism, then I believe they are in the wrong profession. Teaching is supposed to be a quiet search for truth. I do not believe these teach-ins are pursuing eternal verities.

There are nearly 150,000 of our brave men presently committed to the fight to save the people of South Vietnam from Communist slavery. We have made a pledge to save them. We must keep it, in the name of all that is sacred to our own traditions, and in the name of basic human decency.

It is not possible for me to be with our troops in Vietnam to tell them that America stands beside them in their fight, in our fight. But I would consider myself remiss if I did not state this in the Halls of Congress, where the men and women who represent the Nation may speak.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the cruel stupidity of the teach-in may soon become evident to the foolish teachers and the misguided students who are engaging in this work to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that the agents of our Federal Government will take swift and proper action against those people who are destroying their draft cards as their protest against our involvement in Vietnam:

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word about the proposed march on Washington. I have not bothered to note the date of this proposed march. I have no intention of noting the date. I merely wish to note that I shall not be in my office to meet any marchers coming to Washington. I hope none come from among

the great patriots in my own 10th Congressional District, where my constituents know the meaning of this war, and know they must stand solidly with our fighting men. In any event, I have no desire to see any marchers, to discuss anything with any marchers. I shall make a conscious effort to be absent when they arrive. I have nothing to discuss with them. I would, however, suggest that if they really need conversation, they travel into the central highlands of Vietnam, to discuss their problems with our soldiers and marines in the jungles. That conservation should be profitable for them.

CRISIS IN OUR FISCAL POLICY

(Mr. McDADE was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are facing this year something of a crisis in our fiscal policy. We have voted the largest budget in the history of the Nation. No one can be unaware of the importance of saving wherever saving is possible. We have called upon the Departments of the Federal Government to exercise the wisest prudence in their expenditures. We have called upon them to do so in the past.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to report in this House that in the person of Mr. Frank C. Memmott, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, there is one man who is well aware of the need to save money and who is doing something about it today just as he did something about it yesterday. At my request, Mr. Memmott has made available to me certain documents and directives originating in the Bureau of Mines which are specifically aimed at saving as much money as possible. I am inserting those directives in the RECORD at this point for all of you to read:

APRIL 26, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.

From: Director.

Subject: Convention and foreign travel.

Travel to conventions and foreign countries to attend meetings of technical societies is worthwhile and the Bureau of Mines should be represented at the meetings where a definite benefit from such attendance is

clearly demonstrable. However, the number of requests for convention and foreign travel being received for approval leads me to believe that insufficient thought is given by the persons involved to the need for the requested travel.

There has been and continues to be increased emphasis by the Congress on reduction of travel expenses of Government employees. Furthermore, it is the announced policy of President Johnson and Secretary Udall to utilize our manpower to the fullest extent in order to advance our technical programs as rapidly as possible with available funds. Personnel attending foreign sponsored meetings and conventions without good cause are not being utilized fully.

Supervisors at all levels of operation should carefully consider all applications for convention and foreign travel and forward only those which appear to fit the criteria for serious need for attendance. I am personally interested in making an all-out effort to reduce travel expenses to a minimum and owing to the comparatively large expense involved in both convention and foreign travel this naturally is an item which will bear close scrutiny.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Director.

APRIL 20, 1965.

To: Director, through Assistant Director, Health and Safety.
From: Chief, Division of Coal Mine Inspection.

Subject: Reducing cost of travel.

On April 7, 1965, I attended a conference with officials of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. and health and safety district D, Bureau of Mines, at the company's office, West Frankfort, Ill. When the conference was arranged, we anticipated that it would not be concluded until late in the afternoon which meant the only available return flight would be at 7:45 a.m., April 8, from Evansville, Ind.—a 2-hour drive from West Frankfort.

Inasmuch as we were able to complete the conference before 12 noon on April 7, I contacted the Eastern Air Lines office in Evansville and arranged to change my flight time from 7:45 a.m., April 8, to 3:30 p.m., April 7. My scheduled flight at 7:45 a.m. on April 8 returning from Evansville, Ind., was first class, the only available accommodation on that flight. Inasmuch as I was able to obtain tourist-class accommodations on the return flight on the afternoon of April 7, a saving of \$10.70 in air fare and a saving of \$8 per diem was realized.

I am giving you this statement to prove that we are quite sincere in our efforts to cut costs wherever possible.

H. F. WEAVER.

Control of travel

	Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Budget	Cost	Percent	Budget	Cost	Percent
Administration	\$93,400	\$65,694	70.3	\$93,710	\$62,573	66.7
Mineral resource development	271,700	221,375	81.4	279,080	183,787	65.8
Minerals research	402,500	356,491	88.5	389,500	325,525	83.5
Health and safety	336,900	355,054	105.3	366,800	308,575	84.1
Hellium	61,300	53,676	87.5	85,900	62,755	73.0
Total	1,165,800	1,032,390	88.5	1,215,000	943,215	77.6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.

From: Director.

Subject: Travel.

You are aware of my insistence that every Bureau of Mines official charged with the responsibility of approving travel exercise prudence and care in the expenditure of such

funds. With your cooperation, in fiscal year 1965 we did a good job of restricting travel only to those trips we considered absolutely essential for conduct of the Bureau's business. During the 1966 fiscal year, I am again soliciting your help in exercising a tight control over the expenditures of the Bureau's travel funds. One way to accomplish our goal is for you to alert all members of your

October 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26789

implies that our involvement in Vietnam was the result of a plot carried out by such distinguished Americans as JOHN F. KENNEDY, MAURINE NEUBERGER, EDNA KELLEY, EMANUEL CELLER, and Cardinal Spellman. I would also point out to you that the Fund For The Republic, which allegedly sponsored the publication of the material, has been denounced by the very people who provided the money for its establishment.

I am equally confident that you were also unaware of Mr. Scheer's previous efforts in behalf of the Vietcong, Fidel Castro, and Mao Tse Tung.

I enclose a brief résumé of Mr. Scheer's activities which I am also sending to all Members of Congress for their information. I am sending this to them as I believe they should be informed of the kind of material being printed and distributed by an alleged education organization which enjoys a tax-exempt status. I, of course, am sending it only to the Members who received a copy from you.

With warmest personal regard, I am
Sincerely yours,
RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

ENCLOSURE PREPARED BY REPRESENTATIVE
ICHORD ON ROBERT SCHEER

(The following is a brief résumé of the previous activities of Mr. Robert Scheer, based on documented evidence held in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.)

1. Robert Scheer is a former executive committee member of the University of California at Berkeley chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

2. Robert Scheer has traveled to Vietnam. He appeared as an introductory speaker at a showing of the film entitled "War in Vietnam." The film was prepared by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, "Vietcong," and was confiscated by Federal authorities in New York.

3. Robert Scheer was among the first students to violate the Cuban travel ban. An investigation of this travel by the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicated the trip was financed to a large degree by a foreign power. While in Cuba, the students cheered at a film showing American aircraft being shot down.

4. Robert Scheer's book "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere," damns the U.S. policies and defiles Fidel Castro.

5. Robert Scheer was among those who signed a petition urging President Kennedy to adopt a fairer policy toward Cuba.

6. Robert Scheer is actively engaged in the programs of the Women's Strike for Peace and appears in their "demonstrations," including the massive march in Times Square, New York City, coinciding with the march on Washington.

7. The following are but a few of the many quotes attributed to Robert Scheer:

"We cannot expect Jack Kennedy to feel the necessity of political freedom—he has never been threatened by the state, never questioned by the secret police (FBI), never seen his parents arrested as political prisoners."

"You must talk about the economic development of Communist China and the role of profit in the perversion of the American consumer."

"As imperfect as they may be, Nasser, Mao, Toure, and Castro have liberated their people for the first time in modern history and we as a people oppose them."

8. Robert Scheer is an announced participant in the coming international days of protest on October 15 and 16 which is sponsored by the Vietnam Day Committee. This is the committee which attempted to halt the troop trains in California.

(Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ADDABBO'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FENCING AND SPRAYING POSE DUAL THREAT TO ANTELOPE ON PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS

(Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the welfare of antelope herds on our federally owned public grazing lands in the West. I warned earlier that the erection of thousands of miles of fences on these public lands inhibited the movement of antelope herds which must range widely for the food and water they need to survive.

This concern prompted me on September 30, 1965, to introduce H.R. 11359, a bill to prohibit the erection of fences which impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing and other purposes.

On October 9, 1965, the Bureau of Land Management issued a position statement on its fencing policy on publicly owned lands in the West. I discussed this statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1965, pages 26092-26094—and reported that I was encouraged that the BLM was recommending a tightening of its fencing policy.

The threat to antelope posed by the network of fences on publicly owned grazing lands—over 6,100 miles of such fencing has been erected in Wyoming alone—is described in an excellent article in the October 15 issue of Conservation News, a publication of the National Wildlife Federation.

The article points out that the BLM and livestock operators have embarked on still another program that could cut down on the antelope population—aerial spraying to kill sagebrush. Cattle and sheep do not eat the hardy plant, but it is a staple in the antelope's diet.

Since an estimated two-thirds of our antelope live on public lands administered by the BLM, it follows that the Bureau's policy on management of this land will play an important role in determining the future of antelope herds.

Congress originally directed the BLM to manage these public lands for multiple uses, including livestock production, wildlife habitat, recreation and timber production.

The Conservation News article implies that this directive is not being followed by the BLM.

I include a copy of the article by Willard T. Johns, Assistant Chief of the Division of Conservation Education of the National Wildlife Federation:

WHERE THE LIVESTOCK, BUT NOT THE ANTELOPE, CAN PLAY
(By Will Johns)

The West, according to the popular ballad, is supposed to be the place where seldom

is heard a discouraging word and the deer and the antelope play.

Not any more. At least not in Wyoming where the hottest controversy in years is boiling up among conservationists, sportsmen, ranchers, and the Bureau of Land Management. At stake is the future of the pronghorn antelope, America's only genuine and distinct mammal—a species which has no living relatives in any other part of the world.

The fleet-footed, graceful and colorful pronghorn antelope is a creature of the prairies and wide-open spaces. It once ranged over an area of 2 million square miles in the central part of the continent—north into Canada, south into Mexico, east to Iowa and west to Oregon, Washington, and some parts of California. Some estimates of its numbers in the early 1800's ran as high as 30 to 40 million animals. But less than 75 years later, a 2-year survey in 1922-24 by State and Federal conservation agencies revealed that only about 26,600 antelope were left in the 16 Western States. It looked like the end of the pronghorn as a game animal and almost all of the States moved quickly to close the seasons and give the antelope full legal protection. Within 30 years, however, the antelope came back. Between 1924 and 1957, Wyoming's antelope herd increased from less than 7,000 to 105,000; in Montana from about 3,000 to 59,000; in Arizona from about 650 to more than 9,000. Today, surveys indicate antelope herds on the remaining range may total over 300,000 animals.

Now, however, the fate of the antelope rests not so much with the hunter as it does with other users of its range, especially with Government agencies which control those uses. Today, it is not the hunting rifle that poses a threat to the welfare of these popular and important animals; rather, the doom of the antelope may well be determined by the erection of fences and the application of herbicides on its home on the range.

As with all wild birds and animals, habitat is the key to antelope abundance. But unlike many game animals, antelope habitat has but two simple characteristics—plenty of sagebrush and plenty of wide open space. Over most of its present range, these two simple requirements are also characteristics of federally owned land in the Western States—land still left in the public domain and administered by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management through its State directors and advisory boards. Indeed, two out of every three pronghorn antelope alive today are found on lands administered by this single Bureau.

Here is where the fate of the antelope hangs in the balance—a balance of uses for the public domain. Until fairly recently, there was little, if any, conflict but today new techniques and new materials spell the beginning of a rapid change. From pioneer days, the greatest single use of these lands has been (and still is) the grazing of sheep and cattle. It is a land use upon which a rich and powerful industry has been built and for years, many livestock operators have considered grazing to be the only use for which these lands are suited.

Fortunately for antelope, there has been no great problem in their sharing the range with cattle or sheep. Occasionally a feeling of resentment cropped up among some ranchers who felt the antelope were competing with their cattle or sheep for the available forage. Wildlife biologists, however, long since have proved that with proper stocking rates of domestic livestock and game there is little competition for specific food plants.

Still another ballad expressing the feeling of the old West contained the line, "Don't fence me in." And, until recent years, most of the people and all of the antelope felt that fences on the open range were too costly and really unnecessary. Where some control

October 20, 1965

or watchfulness over flocks of sheep or herds of cattle was necessary, livestock operators used cowboys or sheepherders. Today, however, most of the cowboys and other "riders of the purple sage" are seen only on television, at dude ranchs, or in rodcos. Control of grazing now is beginning to take the form of fences—wire fences strung mile after mile across the range in order to divide grazing units and keep sheep and cattle off the highways. These fences do keep livestock within well-defined areas, of course, and do eliminate the cost of hiring men to watch over them. But for the antelope, fences pose a serious problem. Unlike deer and other big game, antelope normally are not good high jumpers. Some pronghorns do have the ability to get across fences, even when running at full speed (up to 50 miles per hour) by projecting themselves through or under the strands of barbed wire. Most adults in time have learned how to jump over a 4-foot fence but many are still lost where fences corner during severe snowstorms. Young antelope, however, usually wind up entangled in the wire or are completely blocked from traditional migration routes.

Coupled with fencing is another, and equally serious, problem. In Wyoming, as in many other places, much of the public domain has been badly overgrazed. The better forage grasses are gone, the top soil eroded away, and about the only plant that can survive is the tough sagebrush. Thus the Bureau of Land Management and the livestock operators are embarked on a major range rehabilitation program. Many techniques have been tried but currently the most popular, and least expensive, seems to be aerial spraying of the herbicide 2,4-D in an oil suspension. The objective is to kill out the sagebrush, then reseed the range in the hope that it will come back to grasses and other forage for livestock. The only hitch is that in many places the only top soil left is the little bit held together under the sagebrush plants. When they are destroyed, wind or water erosion sweeps that soil away and no amount of reseeding will ever bring back suitable forage cover. One study in Montana, for example, showed that after a sagebrush spraying program had been completed, the grass cover increased only 1 percent.

With this background, it is not too difficult to understand the concern of Wyoming sportsmen, as well as that of conservationists everywhere, over current fencing and spraying programs in the "Equality State." In the Bench Corral area of Sublette County north of Big Piney, for example, the Bureau of Land Management has announced it plans to spray 2,4-D to kill out sagebrush on over half of the 64,000 acres in the next 8 years. Already, BLM has sprayed 5,000 acres and has scheduled application of the herbicide next year in the most important antelope fawning area on the Bench Corral. Three years ago, according to Wyoming Game Warden Dave Thomas, the antelope population on the Bench Corral totaled 530 animals. Last year BLM started, or permitted holders of grazing allotments to start, a fence building program as well as spraying to eradicate the sagebrush. The May 1965, spring census showed the antelope population had dropped to 437 and 5 weeks after the spraying of 5,000 acres, the count was 168 animals. Thomas points out that the spray doesn't actually kill the antelope, but it apparently does drive them out of the area and scatters them in small herds from which they don't seem to regroup.

Another "hot spot" in the controversy is located in the Rattlesnake Mountains on some 20,000 acres known as the Cabin Creek Allotment. This includes 18,240 acres of Federal land administered by BLM, 770 acres of State land, and 1,670 acres of deeded land. It was formerly operated by the Grieve fam-

ily as the Diamond Ring Ranch, with cattle using the allotment. When the ranch was sold several years ago, the new owner applied to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to graze both cattle and sheep on the land, as well as permission to construct about 30 miles of sheep-tight fencing. Permission to graze sheep was granted. The Bureau, however, has an agreement of long standing with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to consult with it before authorizing any fences on the public land. In this case, the department refused to give approval because the fencing would be detrimental to the antelope. Last summer, however, a survey of this area showed that the 30 miles of fence had been erected on the public domain without permission from BLM, the Wyoming department, or anyone else. To date, the fence is still up although affidavits have been filed against the Diamond Ring Ranch Company in the hope that the U.S. attorney will file a civil suit compelling the firm to tear it down.

To resolve a growing problem and insure the future of antelope in Wyoming, Tom Bell, president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, has called for a 10-point program, as follows:

1. An indefinite moratorium on sheep-tight fence on the public domain where antelope are involved.

2. Fencing on all important antelope ranges should be kept to a minimum. Where fences are absolutely necessary, they should be no more than a four-strand wire fence, with the bottom wire no less than 16 inches above ground level.

3. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the effects on antelope of fences now in place.

4. A review of grazing fees, with the thought in mind that where minimum fences only are permitted, the fees would remain low; otherwise, where the public is subsidizing the building of fences, the fees would be scaled upward.

5. A modification of a number of fences lying on or across critical migration routes of antelope where these are known, the modification to be as above.

6. A posting of all roads on all lands in grazing districts where there is an interspersal of private and public lands. If the public allows grazing on its land, the private landowner should certainly allow access across theirs.

7. Immediate prosecution of any unauthorized fences and illegal signs.

8. Immediate installation of livestock "exclosures," 5 to 10 acres in size, on the public range in order to determine range rehabilitation through natural processes and then to compare results with present livestock allotments.

9. Immediate implementation of methods to obtain better control of livestock numbers on the public range. There is really no excuse for livestock owners receiving only a light slap on the wrist for consistently overstocking and overgrazing, and for willful trespass.

10. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the long-range effect of sagebrush spraying on all the ecological communities involved.

Echoes of the fight to save the antelope in the "Equality State" are now spreading across the Nation. They sounded through Pinedale in late August when the National Wildlife Federation's officers, staff and board of directors pledged support of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation's stand and carried the plea to save the pronghorn into the Washington offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

This conservation battle is far from over but it reached a new level of intensity on September 30 when Representative HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H.R.

11359) in the 89th Congress. The Reuss bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to ban from the public lands any fence which impedes the movement of wildlife. If the Secretary finds a grazing licensee has built such a fence, he shall require it to be removed by the licensee, and shall see that it is removed at the licensee's expense if the licensee fails to remove it himself within 30 days. Any future illegal fencing shall be the cause for a revocation of the grazing license.

As storm clouds gather over the home on the range for antelope, livestock, fences and sprayed sagebrush, one point should be made clear. This is not a fight for a single use of the public domain, but rather a fight based on the principle of multiple use—a principle which by law and regulation is supposed to be applied to all of the 18 million acres in Wyoming and 176 million acres in the 11 Western States administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Sportsmen of the Equality State and conservationists throughout the Nation are asking that the antelope be given equal consideration, along with cattle, sheep, horses and other creatures, both wild and domesticated, which live where the buffalo once roamed and the skies are not cloudy all day.

THE SUGAR BILL

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 13 on the floor of the House we debated the sugar bill. I felt that the people in my district were entitled to information that would give them a true picture of what transpired and I therefore sent out on that day the following radio press release. I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

There has been a good deal of comment both in and out of Congress regarding the recently passed sugar bill. Most of this rhetoric has been by persons who are more interested in generating heat than they are in bringing light on this subject.

Heat in itself is not necessarily bad, because as President Truman is reported to have said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Unfortunately, however, numerous scurrilous and character defamation remarks were directed toward members of the Committee on Agriculture. This was uncalled for and was not worthy of the proper debate that should be observed in the House of Representatives.

It pleased me greatly to see a large number of Members from both sides of the aisle rise to the defense of members of this capable committee. In order to keep the record straight, I hope all who are interested in this debate will study carefully the entire text as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would be a grave mistake to rely only on the fragmentary and out-of-context reports that so readily abound.

This committee has worked long and hard on some excellent farm legislation. It would be tragic if we were to allow irresponsible comments to cloud the issue and detract from the work of these conscientious Members of Congress.

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)